

HYPERBOREUS

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσὶ δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὐροῖς
ἔς Ἵπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν

(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29–30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA
DENIS KEYER ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

Vol. 26 2020 Fasc. 2

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

HYPERBOREUS: Классическая филология и история

Выходит два раза в год

Редакция: Н. А. Алмазова, А. Л. Верлинский,
С. К. Егорова (отв. ред. выпуска), Д. В. Кейер

Редакционный совет: Михаэль фон Альбрехт, А. К. Гаврилов,
Пэт Истерлинг, Карло Лукарини, Д. В. Панченко

Адрес редакции и издателя: 197198, С.-Петербург, ул. Красного Курсанта, д. 6/9
Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana (HYPERBOREUS)
Факс: (812) 274-3395, (812) 235-4267
E-mail: hyperbicl@gmail.com
bibliotheca-classica.org/hyperboreus

По вопросам подписки обращаться по адресу редакции.

HYPERBOREUS: Studia Classica

HYPERBOREUS wurde im Jahre 1994 durch die Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana gegründet.

Der Vertrieb außerhalb Rußlands erfolgt durch den Verlag C. H. Beck (Oskar Beck), Wilhelmstr. 9, D-80801 München, Postfachadresse: Postfach 400340, D-80703 München.

Die Zeitschrift erscheint ab 1996 in zwei Halbjahresschriften. Abonnementpreis jährlich ab Vol. 2 € 34,90 (in diesem Betrag sind € 2,28 Mehrwertsteuer enthalten), für das Einzelheft € 19,50 (Mehrwertsteueranteil € 1,28), jeweils zuzüglich Vertriebsgebühren; die Kündigungsfrist des Abonnements beträgt sechs Wochen zum Jahresende. Preis für Vol. 1, 1994/5, auf Anfrage bei dem Verlag C. H. Beck.

Herausgeber: Nina Almazova, Sofia Egorova (verantw.),
Denis Keyer, Alexander Verlinsky

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat: Michael von Albrecht, P. E. Easterling, Alexander Gavrilov,
Carlo M. Lucarini, Dmitri Panchenko

Alle für die Redaktion bestimmten Manuskripte und Einsendungen sind zu richten an:
Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana (HYPERBOREUS)
ul. Krasnogo Kursanta 6/9
197198 St. Petersburg, Russia
Fax: (812) 274-3395, (812) 235-4267
E-mail: hyperbicl@gmail.com
bibliotheca-classica.org/hyperboreus

Die Publikationssprachen im HYPERBOREUS sind Russisch, Englisch, Französisch, Deutsch, Italienisch und Lateinisch; den Beiträgen wird jeweils eine Zusammenfassung auf Englisch und Russisch hinzugefügt.

Entgegnungen werden im HYPERBOREUS nur ausnahmsweise aufgenommen. Eingegangene Druckschriften werden nicht zurückgeschickt. Mit Namen gezeichnete Artikel geben die Auffassung des Verfassers, nicht der Redaktion wieder. Alle Nachrichten werden nach bestem Wissen, aber ohne Gewähr gegeben.

CONSPECTUS

GAUTHIER LIBERMAN Petits riens sophocléens : <i>Edipe à Colone II</i>	173
WALTER LAPINI La chiamarono <i>amplesso rubato</i> (Euripide, <i>Elena 22</i>)	199
VALERIA PETROVA The Bronze Horse and the Lifetime of Simon the Athenian	210
CARLO M. LUCARINI Textkritisches zu Agatharchides von Knidos und zu Markianos von Heraklea	221
SOFIA LARIONOVA Quadrivium in Varro's <i>Disciplines</i>	228
NATALIA KUZNETSOVA Ciceros Kritik an dem antonischen Provokationsgesetz	254
BORIS HOGENMÜLLER <i>Ameana (?) puella defututa</i> . Textkritische Überlegung zu Cat. c. 41 . . .	273
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO Le mouchoir de Vatinius (Quint. <i>Inst.</i> VI, 3, 60)	282
MARIA N. KAZANSKAYA Ἰφιάνασσα: A Lost Homeric Reading in Lucian?	296
SVETLANA DUBOVA Apuleius' Venus and Speech Characterization	308
HANAN M. I. ISMAIL Some Insights into Egypt's History under the Reign of Maximinus Thrax (Mid-March / 25 March AD 235 – 10 May AD 238)	320
Keywords	341

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке
Summary in Russian and English

Gauthier Liberman

PETITS RIENS SOPHOCLEÏENS :
ŒDIPE À COLONE
II*

812 ἄπελθ', ἐρῶ γὰρ καὶ πρὸ τῶνδε, μηδέ με
φύλασσο' ἐφορμῶν ἔνθα χρῆ ναίειν ἐμέ.

Œdipe ne veut pas se voir imposer par Créon l'endroit où il doit résider (cf. vv. 784–786). Le texte transmis comporte une métaphore navale fondée sur une expression caractéristique, « monter la garde en mouillant et faisant barrage » : rapprocher Thucydide 3, 33, 3 στρατόπεδόν τε ποιεῖσθαι καὶ φυλακὴν σφίσι καὶ ἐφόρμησιν παρασχεῖν, « (les ennemis ne furent pas contraints de) se retrancher et de les amener eux, les Athéniens, à monter la garde et à leur faire barrage en mouillant » ; Polyainos, *Stratag.* 6, 23, 1 ναῦς Ἀττικὰς περὶ Ναύπακτον ἐφορμεῖν παραφυλαττούσας. Le problème est que Créon n'a jamais prétendu monter la garde là où Œdipe doit résider : il aurait été absurde qu'il le prétendît et il est absurde qu'Œdipe lui reproche cette prétention. Le sens est certainement « ne me prescrite pas l'endroit où je dois résider » et c'est en vain qu'on cherche à le tirer du texte transmis. C'est ce qu'a vu Blaydes 1859, qui, entre autres conjectures, suggère πρότασσο(ε) (cf. v. 494) et veut que φύλασσο(ε) soit une glose de ἐφορμῶν qui, en pénétrant dans le texte, a pris la place du mot juste. Pour ma part, je crois que φύλασσο' ἐφορμῶν forme un tout aux composantes solidaires et que ἐφορμῶν n'est qu'un peu moins sujet à caution que φύλασσο(ε). Sophocle avait peut-être écrit μηδέ μοι | σὺ τάσσο' (ou πρότασσο') ἐνοχλῶν ἔνθα χρῆ ναίειν ἐμέ, « ne me dis pas importunément où je dois habiter » (cf. *El.* 1495, en début de trimètre, μη τάσσε ; *Ajax* 824–825, ἐκ δὲ τῶνδέ μοι | σὺ πρῶτος, ὦ Ζεῦ, καὶ γὰρ εἰκός, ἄρκεσον ; *Œd. rex* 445–446, ὡς παρὼν σὺ γ' ἐμποδῶν | ὀχλεῖς). Loin qu'une glose de ἐφορμῶν ait amené φύλασσο(ε),

* Première partie dans *Hyperboreus* 26: 1 (2020) 26–43. J'ai écrit par étourderie “article indéfini” (p. 30 l. 4) pour “pronom indéfini”. La faute θείας pour αἷς (p. 40 l. 4) s'explique peut-être mieux par une dittographie (le mot précédent est ἐμβατεύει) qui entraîna une correction (<θ>είας) ; l'apparat critique (p. 39) ne précise pas que Lloyd-Jones–Wilson lisent οὐδ' αὐθ' | ἄ χρυσάνιος. J'aurais enfin dû signaler ceci : éditeurs et commentateurs paraissent ignorer que l'explication véritable des vers 144–145 repose sur la mise au jour d'une confusion entre πρῶτος et πρωτός (voir Schulze 1892, 23).

c'est le lapsus φύλασσ(ε) qui aura, je présume, amené ἐφορμῶν comme son corollaire. Le lapsus que je suppose est peut-être due à la fréquente occurrence du verbe signifant « garder » : par exemple 21, κάθιζέ νυν με καὶ φύλασσε τὸν τυφλόν (Œdipe demande à Antigone d'avoir l'œil sur lui) ; φύλασσε πατέρα τόνδε (Ismène à sa sœur); 638–639, σέ νιν | τάξω φυλάσσειν (Thésée au chœur à propos d'Œdipe). On notera que la correction a aussi l'avantage de ne pas prêter à Sophocle le gauche με... ἐμέ, que Jebb croit illustrer avec un passage (*El.* 1359–1360) où les deux pronoms sont chacun à un cas différent.¹

- 1050 (...) οὗ Πότνια σεμνὰ τιθνοῦνται τέλη
 θνατοῖσιν, ὧν καὶ χρυσέα
 κλῆς ἐπὶ γλώσσο βέβα-
 κε προσπόλων Εὐμολπιδᾶν·
 ἐνθ' οἶμαι τὸν ἐγρεμάχαν
 1055 Θησέα καὶ τὰς διστόλους
 ἀδμητας ἀδελφὰς
 ἀντάρκει τάχ' ἐμμίξειν βοῶ
 τούσδ' ἀνὰ χώρους· || strophe finis
-
- ἢ που τὸν ἐφέσπερον antistrophe initium
- 1060 πέτρας νιφάδος πελῶσ'
 Οἰάτιδος εἰς νομόν
 πῶλοισιν ἢ ῥιμφορμάτοις
 φεύγοντες ἀμίλλαις.
- 1065 ἀλώσεται· δεινὸς ὁ προσχώρων Ἴαρης,
 δεινὰ δὲ Θησειδᾶν ἀκμά.
 πᾶς γὰρ ἀστράπτει χαλι-
 νός, πᾶσα δ' ὀρμᾶται κ<λονεῖ> τ'
 ἀμπυκτήρια <στομίων> [φάλαρα πῶλων]
- 1070 ἄμβασις, οἱ τὰν ἱππίαν
 τιμῶσιν Ἀθάναν
 καὶ τὸν πόντιον γαιάοχον
 Πέας φίλον υἱόν. |||

1050 σεμνὰ Valckenaer : σεμναὶ || 1054 ἐγρεμάχαν *Lrz* : ὀρειοβάταν *L^{7p}* : ὀρειβάταν *a* || 1057 παντάρκει *Dindorf* : ἀντάρκει *Meineke* || 1059 ἢ *Kr* : ἢ *Lazt* || 1060 *λιτάδος « glatt » *Hartung* : λιχάδος = ἀποτόμου *Meineke* | περῶσ' *Hartung* || 1061 εἰς νομόν *Hartung* 1851, 263 (*uide et Jebb*) : ἐκ νομοῦ *codd.* || 1068 κλονεῖ τ' *scripsi* (κλονεῖν *Wilamowitz* 1921, 403 n. 2) :

¹ Pour l'absence de *correptio Attica*, comparer ὄχλον fr. 94 *Radt* et voir *Rumpel* 1866, 6. – Je discute les vers 866–867 dans l'introduction d'une édition commentée à paraître de la *monobiblos* de Properce (« *Huelva Classical Monographs* »).

κατ' codd. : καθεῖς Schneidewin || 1069 στομίωv Wecklein 1889 | φάλαρα gloss. eiecit Bothe (cf. Σ ἀμπυκτήρια· φάλαρα ; Hesych. α 3820 ἀμπυκτήρια· τὰ φάλαρα. Σοφοκλῆς Οἰδίποδι ἐν Κολωνῶ) | πώλων gloss. eiecit Dindorf 1860.

Le second *stasimon* est un chef d'œuvre abîmé du lyrisme grec. Le chœur voudrait bien se trouver, entre autres, sur la côte d'Éleusis, où,² selon lui, peut se produire la rencontre des Athéniens et de ceux qu'ils pourchassent, les Thébains auteurs de l'enlèvement d'Antigone et d'Ismène. La fin très belle de l'antistrophe étant défigurée dans les éditions récentes, je présente ici une version plausible en combinant les interventions de plusieurs érudits : « tous les mors jettent des éclairs ; toute la chevauchée s'élance et secoue les brides des freins » (1067–1070). Le passage a souffert de l'invasion de gloses qui ont chassé les leçons originales. Rapprocher du texte imprimé ci-dessus Euripide, *Suppl.* 584–587 ὀρμαῖσθαι χρεῶν | πάντ' ἄνδρ' ὀπλίτην ἀρμάτων τ' ἐπεμβάτην | μοναμπύκων τε φάλαρα κινεῖσθαι στόμα | ἀφρῶ καταστάζοντα Καδμείων χθόνα, « tous les fantassins, tous les passagers des chars doivent s'élaner et les brides³ des chevaux de selle doivent être secouées, faisant dégoutter d'écume leur gueule, en direction de la terre des Cadméens »⁴ (c'est Thésée qui parle) ; *Iph. Aul.* 149 πάλιν ἐξόρμα, σεῖε χαλινούς, dans le texte et avec le commentaire de Hermann.⁵ La conjonction de ὀρμαῖσθαι et de κινεῖσθαι corrobore ὀρμαῖται κλονεῖ τε (il y a synaphie verbale entre les colons 3–4 et 4–5 de la seconde période de l'antistrophe ; dans la strophe, les colons 4–5 sont en synaphie uniquement prosodique : même variation entre les colons 2–3 de l'antistrophe et de la strophe).

Il reste à dire sur les v. 1050–1054, pourtant célèbres et discutés. Remarquons que l'amphibologie de leur construction, bien indiquée par Hermann 1841,⁶ est peut-être intentionnelle, destinée à incarner

² Voir Leake 1847, 147–149 ; Wecklein 1889, 96–98 et Jebb 1889, 286–288.

³ Chamoux 1958, 576 entend « bossettes » mais κινεῖσθαι implique qu'il est question des brides : cf. le tour χαλινούς κινεῖν ; Sophocle, *El.* 712–713 ἡνίας χεροῖν | ἔσεισαν.

⁴ J. Diggle (*OCT*) considère στόμα comme gâté.

⁵ Hermann 1831, 15–16. N. Wecklein conjecture et lit εἰσόρμα.

⁶ Hermann et Jebb préfèrent « à l'intention des mortels, sur la langue desquels est posée la clef d'or des Eumolpides ministres du culte ». Dans une note très savante, Lobeck 1829, 36 entend « les mystères, dont la clef d'or est posée sur la langue des Eumolpides » (il suggère que βοῦς signifie « boja », *quod nomen vulgo quidem de collari sive λαιμοπέδη dicitur, sed quoque γλωττοπέδη sive camo convenit, qualis damnatorum ori applicabatur*). Kern 1916–1919, 435 est d'accord avec Hermann et Jebb. Il offre une explication de τιθηνοῦνται dont les commentateurs de Sophocle devraient tenir compte : « les Potniai sont les nourrices du myste en ce qu'il renaît de l'utérus de Korè ».

dans l'expression l'impenétrabilité ambiguë et secrète des Mystères. Les commentateurs ne se penchent guère sur βέβακε. Mähly⁷ considère le mot comme « gewiss ganz absonderlich hier » et veut le remplacer par πέπαγε, mais βέβακε est, chez Sophocle et dans l'expression qu'il modifie, βούς ἐπὶ γλώσση μέγας βέβηκεν (Eschyle, *Ag.* 36–37), « a great ox has set his foot upon my tongue », ⁸ au sens idiomatique de « se trouve fermement planté »⁹ : voir Hésychios β 411, βεβηκότας· βεβαίως ἐνεστηκότας et Archiloque fr. 130, 3–4 West, πολλάκις δ' ἀνατρέπουσι καὶ μάλ' εὖ βεβηκότας | ὑπτίους (ἄνδρας) ; 114, 4 West, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκῶς ποσσί. Pott¹⁰ explique le passage de l'idée de mobilité à celle de fermeté et d'arrêt par le pas (cf. les mots du type « base », le tour χαλκοβατὲς δῶ) et grâce au parfait indiquant qu'un espace a été parcouru et est donc praticable, non meuble : l'adjectif βέβαιος illustre très bien le changement de sens.

Lloyd-Jones–Wilson ont tort de préférer la variante ἦ που (v. 1059), car, comme le rappelle Hermann, qui retrouve ἦ par conjecture, cette conjonction introduit la troisième possibilité envisagée par le chœur, après ἦ πρὸς Πυθίαις ἦ λαμπάσιν ἀκταῖς (1048–1049). Le participe φεύγοντες (v. 1063) est approprié si les fuyards thébains, et eux seuls, sont le sujet du verbe πελῶσι. Mais alors, rien n'indiquant un changement de sujet, ces fuyards doivent aussi être le sujet de l'infinitif ἐμμεῖξεν dans la strophe. Or cette interprétation est en tout état de cause impossible : les deux seuls sujets possibles de l'infinitif sont (a) les poursuivants¹¹ ou (b) les poursuivants *et* les fuyards, enlevées par les Thébains. Selon toute apparence, le sujet du verbe πελῶσι (ou περῶσι) et de l'infinitif ἐμμεῖξεν est le même, ce sont ou les poursuivants ou ces derniers *et* ceux qu'ils pourchassent. Or les poursuivants ne fuient pas, ils vont aussi vite que possible, σπεύδοντες, qualification qui convient aussi aux fuyards (cf. Thésée aux vv. 1016–1017, ὡς οἱ μὲν ἐξηρπασμένοι ¹² | σπεύδουσιν,

⁷ Mähly 1862, 362.

⁸ Voir Fraenkel 1950, II, 23.

⁹ Sur la valeur de présent de cette forme, voir Willi 2018, 231–232 et plus généralement Bréal 1900, 277–278.

¹⁰ Pott 1867a, 30–31.

¹¹ Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 247 prennent καὶ au sens de *etiam* (ainsi L. Spengel) et expliquent « Theseus will 'join' the sisters also (καὶ) to self-sufficient aid, meaning that by his prompt use of the strength that enables him by himself to achieve mighty deeds he will save them, as he has saved many others ». Mais, dans cette interprétation par ailleurs très alambiquée, καὶ = *etiam* lui-même semble bien obscur. Dindorf 1860 y voit un bouche-trou métrique et conjecture Αἰγεΐδαν pour Θησέα καὶ.

¹² « Les auteurs de l'enlèvement », si le moyen est possible. Jebb défend et adopte la cj. ἐξηρπασμένοι, « les auteurs du forfait ».

ἡμεῖς δ' οἱ παθόντες ἔσταμεν). Le participe φεύγοντες semble donc résulter de quelque confusion. Une sorte d'*error Wattianus*¹³ à distance est possible, car Thésée dit à Créon, vv. 1022–1023 : εἰ δ' ἐγκρατεῖς¹⁴ φεύγουσιν, οὐδὲν δεῖ πονεῖν· | ἄλλοι γὰρ οἱ σπεύσοντες¹⁵ οὓς οὐ μή ποτε | χάρας φυγόντες τῆσδ' ἐπεύξωνται θεοῖς. Le substantif ἀμίλλαις paraît être en faveur de ceux qui voient dans les poursuivants et les fuyards le sujet de l'infinitif et du verbe conjugué à un mode personnel. Selon Dindorf 1860, la qualification d'Antigone et d'Ismène comme ἀδμητας, qu'il prend au sens de *indomitas* et non de *innuptas*, suggère que Thésée fera participer au combat les deux sœurs et donc que ἀδμητας ἀδελφὰς est le régime de ἐμμείξειν. Mais ἀδμητας garderait la pertinence que fait valoir Dindorf si le sens disputé de αὐτάρκει ἐμμείξειν βοᾷ était soit « ils prendront part à un vaillant combat » (ainsi Reisig,¹⁶ d'après un sens du substantif reconnu chez Homère par Aristarque¹⁷) soit « Thésée et les deux indomptables sœurs livreront combat (contre leur commun ennemi) avec de vaillants cris de guerre ». Jebb objecte à cette interprétation que les deux sœurs sont aux mains de l'ennemi et ne peuvent le combattre ; il rend ἀδμητας par « maids » et entend « will soon meet within our borders, amid a war-cry of men strong to save », mais cette interprétation du délicat αὐτάρκει βοᾷ semble forcée. Rapprochant Xénophon, *Anab.* 4, 3, 19, Radermacher 1909 entend que Thésée et les deux sœurs pousseront de vigoureux cris de guerre, mais il oublie qu'Antigone et Ismène ne sont pas parmi les Athéniens. Selon Bellermann 1883, en les libérant, Thésée environnera Antigone et Ismène de cris de guerre « sich selbst genügend (...), weil er keiner weiteren Hilfe bedarf, um sein Ziel zu erreichen ; also etwa erfolgverheissend, oder geradezu erfolgreich ». Mais les v. 1046–1047, 1065–1066 et 1102–1103 montrent qu'on en est venu aux mains et, de surcroît, les deux derniers vers mentionnés, que prononce Antigone, αἶδε γὰρ χέρες | Θησέως ἔσωσαν φιλάτων τ' ὀπαίωνων, suggèrent que les deux sœurs furent l'objet de la bataille sans combattre elles-mêmes.

¹³ Consistant à répéter, de deux mots, celui qui ne devait pas l'être.

¹⁴ Housman 1892, 160 conjecture οὐγκρατεῖς, c'est-à-dire οἱ ἐγκρατεῖς. Le Housman de 1925, 80, qui rappelle à Wilamowitz et à Pearson qu'il faut écrire οὐγκρατεῖς, a oublié de morigéner le Housman de 1892.

¹⁵ Correction de Meineke pour σπεύδοντες. Le mot ἄλλοι est suspect : Nauck conjecture πολλοί, je suggère ἀλκῆ γὰρ οἱ σπεύσοντες, « nous serons aidés par de rapides intervenants : aucun risque de voir les fuyards remercier les dieux de leur avoir permis d'échapper à ceux-là en quittant notre pays ».

¹⁶ Reisig 1823, CXXXV.

¹⁷ Voir Lehrs 1882, 149.

J'entendrais donc que Thésée et les filles d'Œdipe sont censées devoir être parties prenantes d'un combat, le premier en se battant, les autres en faisant l'objet de la lutte. Toutefois Hartung¹⁸ semble fondé à mettre en doute l'emploi intransitif de ἐμμείξειν et, bien que son τοὺς *ἐνιχώρους doive être rejeté, il a peut-être raison de reconnaître sous τοῦσδ' ἀνὰ χῶρους, qui ne fait que répéter ἔνθα, le régime du verbe, c'est-à-dire, je le suggère, τοὺς ἀνὰ χῶρον (avec *breuis in longo*, car c'est la fin de la strophe), « Thésée et les deux sœurs rendront témoins les gens du lieu d'une bagarre qui n'aura pas besoin de renfort pour être couronnée de succès » (c'est-à-dire « une bagarre où Thésée vaincra sans renfort »).

λιπαρεῖν γὰρ οὐ καλόν
1202 δίκαια προσχρήζουσιν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν μὲν εὖ
πάσχειν, παθόντα δ' οὐκ ἐπίστασθαι τίειν.

« Il n'est pas honorable, explique Thésée à Œdipe, d'avoir à quémander quand ce qu'on demande est juste, et il n'est pas non plus honorable soi-même de se trouver bien et de ne pas savoir, après s'être bien trouvé, rendre la pareille ». Dans le texte ainsi libellé αὐτὸν, à quoi en réalité rien n'est contreposé dans le second membre du balancement, est superfétatoire, alors que manque l'indication de la source du fait de εὖ πάσχειν, « se trouver bien <de l'action de quelqu'un> ». Je suggère que αὐτὸν est une faute pour ἔκ του, *ab aliquo bene pati*, si j'ose ce latin mâtiné d'hellénisme : cf. *Œd. rex* 1107–1108 δέξατ' ἔκ του | Νυμφᾶν ἐλικωπίδων ; *Ant.* 620–621 σοφία γὰρ ἔκ του | κλεινὸν ἔπος πέφανται ; *El.* 1029 ἀλλ' οὐ ποτ' ἐξ ἑμοῦ γε μὴ πάθης τόδε ; *Prom. uinct.* 759 ἔκ Διὸς πάσχω κακῶς.

ὅστις τοῦ πλέονος μέρους
χρήζει τοῦ μετρίου παρῆς
1214 ζῶειν, σκαιοσύναν φυλάσ-
σων ἐν ἑμοὶ κατάδηλος ἔσται.

« Quiconque désire la part plus grande en repoussant la part raisonnable à vivre, il m'apparaîtra évident que celui-là observe scrupuleusement la folie ». Il saute aux yeux que φυλάσσω, défendu par Jebb à coup de faux « parallèles »,¹⁹ n'est pas le mot juste, indiqué par

¹⁸ Hartung 1851, 262.

¹⁹ Eur. *Ion* 735–737 ὦ θύγατερ, ἄξι' ἀξίων γεννητόρων | ἦθη φυλάσσεις κού καταισχύνας' ἔχεις | τοὺς σοὺς ; *Œd. Col.* 626 ; 1180.

Ant. 1028 αἰθαδία τοι σκαιότητ' ὀφλισκάνει, ου 470 σχεδόν τι μῶρω μωρίαν ὀφλισκάνω. À cela s'ajoute que ἔσται devrait être un présent. La solution est donc, ce semble, non ὀφείλων (Mähly), qui est à contre-emploi, mais ὀφλήσων²⁰... ἔστι : « il m'apparaît évident qu'il sera exposé au grief de folie ». Il s'agit là d'un emploi tout idiomatique du futur que Moorhouse appelle « gnomique ».²¹ Les trois glyconiens sont suivis d'un décasyllabe alcaïque, qui, avec sa cadence (« pendant ending »), fait fonction de clausule : il y a entre cette période et la suivante un hiatus légitime.

1230 ὡς εὔτ' ἄν τὸ νέον παρή
 κούφας ἀφροσύνας φέρον,
 τίς πλαγὰ πολύμοχθος ἔ-
 ξω; τίς οὐ καμάτων ἐνι;

1230 φέρων L || 1231 τί r | πλαγὰ van Herwerden : πλάγθη **Lazt** : πλάγθη r.

Le sens de la subordonnée temporelle est non, comme l'entend le scholiaste, « sitôt que la jeunesse est là qui apporte ses légères insouciances » mais, comme on comprend aujourd'hui, « sitôt que l'homme laisse s'éloigner (παρήμι) de lui la jeunesse qui emporte (?) ses légères insouciances ». Je soupçonne que la mésintelligence de παρή, rapporté à πάρεμι, a amené φέρον, qui ne convient à l'évocation de la jeunesse que si l'on comprend « qui emporte » et non « qui apporte ».²² C'est τρέφον, « la jeunesse qui nourrit l'insouciance »,²³ qui serait tout à fait conforme à la mentalité et à la phraséologie grecques : Bellermann 1883 cite non sans à-propos *Aiax* 558–559 τέως δὲ κούφοις πνεύμασιν βόσκου, | νέαν ψυχὴν ἀτάλλων, μητρὶ τῆδε χαρμονήν. Chez Pindare, *Pyth.* 6, 29, νόημα τοῦτο φέρων, van Herwerden²⁴ a peut-être raison de suggérer τρέφον, en rapprochant 5, 109–111 κρέσσονα μὲν ἀλικίας νόον φέρβεται γλῶσσάν τε.

²⁰ Avec *correptio Attica*, ὀφλήσων, mot bacchiaque. S'agissant de -φλ-, Rumpel 1866, 5 observe ceci : « productio antecedentis vocalis nulla exstat apud Soph. ». Voir aussi Westphal 1892, 345.

²¹ Voir Moorhouse 1982, 202–203, sans oublier Schulze 1892, 63 et Wackernagel 1926, 206–207.

²² Comparer ou plutôt opposer le célèbre passage de l'*Ars poetica* d'Horace 175–176, *Multa ferunt anni uenientes commoda secum, | multa recedentes adimunt.*

²³ « With follies light as the feather Doth Youth to man befall » (Housman *ap.* Higham–Bowra 1938, 379).

²⁴ Van Herwerden 1882, 19.

1240 ἐν ᾧ (sc. γῆρα) τλάμων ὄδ', οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος,
 πάντοθεν βόρειος ὥς τις ἀκτὰ
 κυματοπλήξ χειμερία κλονεῖται,
 ὥς καὶ τόνδε κατ' ἄκρας
 δειναὶ κυματοαγεῖς
 ἄται κλονέουσιν ἀεὶ ξυνοῦσαι (...)

1242 ὥς codd., quos sequuntur Wilamowitz 1921, 256, Lloyd-Jones–Wilson et Avezzù : ὥς Brunck | κατ' ἄκρας codd. : κατὰ κράς Wilamowitz, recte ut puto || 1244 ἄται **rat** : αἶ τε Lz.

Le sujet de κλονεῖται ne saurait être Œdipe (« il est comme un rivage... »), sinon il y a redite intolérable entre ὄδε (Œdipe) κλονεῖται et τόνδε (Œdipe) κλονέουσιν ; or le chœur ne saurait non plus être le sujet de κλονεῖται, car il faudrait κλονοῦμαι. Il s'ensuit que la ponctuation commune, celle du texte imprimé ci-dessus, et le maintien de ὥς et le rejet de ὥς (Brunck) v. 1242 sont fourvoyés. Le chœur insiste sur le fait qu'il n'est pas le seul à être vieux :²⁵ *in senectute uersatur miser hic, non ego solus*. Or ce propos est compromis par l'absence de ponctuation forte après le v. 1239 et la construction que la virgule implique. Il faut donc mettre une ponctuation forte après le v. 1239,²⁶ admettre l'ellipse de ἐστί au sens de « il se trouve »,²⁷ comprendre, par ὥς τις..., *quemadmodum litus aliquod uexatur*, et lire v. 1242 ὥς, *ita Oedipum aerumnae uexant*. À la différence de la traduction de Wilamowitz,²⁸ la traduction de Housman²⁹ montre qu'il avait bien compris la structure du très célèbre passage : « This man, as me, even so Have the evil days overtaken ; And like as a cape sea-shaken With tempest at earth's last verges And shock of all winds that blow, His head the seas of woe, The thunders of awful surges Ruining overflow ». La pénétration et le sens poétique de Housman

²⁵ Comparer, pour la phraséologie, *El.* 528 ἢ γὰρ Δίκη νιν εἶλεν, οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνη.

²⁶ Ainsi déjà Benedict 1820, 175, Hartung 1851 et Bellermann 1883. Willink 2010, 465 ponctue bizarrement après πάντοθεν.

²⁷ Voir Brugmann 1925, 61. Il distingue ellipse et brachylogie d'un côté, et véritable phrase nominale de l'autre.

²⁸ Wilamowitz 1923, 361. Texte grec et analyse métrique chez Wilamowitz 1921, 256–257, à quoi l'on contreposera Schroeder 1930, 142 § 237. L'objection de Schroeder selon laquelle la catalexe bacchique (1244) exclut l'interprétation ionienne est fautive : voir Wilamowitz 1886, 125–161 et Friedländer 1969, 385–394. Schroeder, Dale 1981, 65 et Willink 2010, 465–466 délimitent les colons des vv. 1245–1248 d'après les membres de phrase grammaticaux. En lisant αἰ δ' ἀκτῖν' ἀνὰ μέσσαν à la place de αἰ δ' ἀνὰ μέσσαν ἀκτῖν' (1247), Willink élimine un grave défaut de la colométrie de Schroeder et de Dale.

²⁹ *Ap.* Higham–Bowra 1938, 379.

peuvent aussi contribuer à la solution d'un problème négligé. « Shock of all winds that blow » semble rendre πάντοθεν en ajoutant au texte grec la mention des vents. Or Reisig³⁰ relève entre πάντοθεν et βόρειος une contradiction, qu'il résout en lisant ποντόθεν, mais πάντοθεν annonce très bien les vv. 1245–1248, qui évoquent les malheurs fondant de tous les points cardinaux, comme des vagues poussées par les vents. L'adjectif βόρειος est-il un bouche-trou malencontreux destiné à remédier à la disparition du substantif πνοαῖσιν après πάντοθεν ou un commentaire malheureux dont l'intrusion a expulsé πνοαῖσιν ? On sent combien ce mot est approprié en rapprochant *Ant.* 586–593 ὥστε πόντιον | οἶδμα δυσπνόοις ὅταν | Θρήσησιν ἔρεβος ὕφαλον ἐπιδράμη πνοαῖς, | κυλίνδει βυσσόθεν | κελαινὰν θῖνα, καὶ δυσάνεμοι | στόνω βρέμουσιν ἀντιπλήγες ἀκταί,³¹ ainsi que Pindare, *Pyth.* 9, 46–48 χῳπόσαι | ἐν θαλάσῃ καὶ ποταμοῖς ψάμαθοι | κύμασι³² ῥιπαῖς τ' ἀνέμων κλονέονται.

πρὸς νῦν σε κρηῶν, πρὸς θεῶν ὁμογνίων
αἰτῶ πιθέσθαι καὶ παρεικαθεῖν, ἐπεὶ
1335 πτωχοὶ μὲν ἡμεῖς καὶ ξένοι, ξένος δὲ σύ·

1333 πρὸς² Kra : καὶ Lzt || 1334 παρεικαθεῖν Elmsley : paroxytone
codd. | ξένος Lra Zn^{sl} : πτωχὸς zt.

Polynice supplie son père de l'aider. L'invocation des sources, dont Jebb rapproche *Ant.* 844, et d'autres passages, surprendrait moins si elle était suivie, comme dans les passages qu'allègue Jebb, de l'invocation de choses analogues, mais le vis-à-vis de κρηῶν et de θεῶν ὁμογνίων, « les dieux de notre γένος », semble avoir légitimement étonné³³ et Jebb cite les conjectures κείνων (van Herwerden, renvoyant à χρηστηρίων v. 1331) et Θεῶν (Nauck, cf. *Ant.* 844–845, ἰὼ Διρκαῖαι κρηῖναι Θήβας τ' εὐαρμάτου ἄλσος). La suggestion de van Herwerden est surtout « paléographique ». Mais le mot κρηῶν pourrait bien être une sorte de « Perseverationsfehler »

³⁰ Reisig 1822, 350–351.

³¹ Texte de Griffith 2000.

³² Fautive est, dans le passage de Pindare cité plus bas, la variante κύμασιν (*dico propter B. Snell et H. Maehler*) : la syllabe finale de κύμασι devant ῥιπαῖς est longue (voir Heimer 1883–1884, 63–64).

³³ Wilamowitz père chez Wilamowitz fils 1917, 358 n. 1, préfère la variante πρὸς νῦν σε κρηῶν καὶ θεῶν ὁμογνίων ; il faut, remarque-t-il justement (malgré l'avis contraire de Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 255), une détermination à κρηῶν : c'est ὁμογνίων, « uns gemeinsam zugehörig ». Mais la conjonction de coordination affaiblit l'invocation et ὁμογνίων n'est pas l'épithète idéale pour κρηῶν. La conjecture de Dawe 1996 πρὸς θ' ἔδων, contient aussi une conjonction rhétoriquement nuisible.

due à χρηστηρίων (v. 1331) et peut-être au souvenir des « sources dircéennes » et... à la soif du copiste ! Si c'est le cas, il est erroné de rechercher un mot « paléographiquement » proche de κρηνῶν. Polynice invoque devant son frère les θεῶν βωμοὶ πατρῶων³⁴ chez Euripide, *Phoen.* 604, et l'on pourrait songer à βωμῶν. Mais l'invocation des dieux de la cité précéderait d'une façon pertinente celle des dieux du γένος : voir Plutarque, *Animine an corporis affectiones sint peiores* 501 e, οὐ θύσοντες οὔτοι συνελήλυθασι πατρίοις θεοῖς οὐδ' ὁμογνίων μεθέξοντες ἱερῶν ἀλλήλοισι ; Julien, *Ἀθηναίων τῆ βουλῆ καὶ τῶ δήμῳ* 8, Μάρτυρα καλῶ τὸν Δία καὶ πάντας θεοὺς πολιούχους τε καὶ ὁμογνίους.³⁵ Je suggère donc de lire πρὸς νὺν σε πατρίων,³⁶ πρὸς θεῶν ὁμογνίων. Pour le placement dans le second syntagme du substantif afférent aux deux syntagmes (σχῆμα ἀπὸ κοινοῦ), voir *El.* 929, ἡδὺς οὐδὲ μητρὶ δυσχερῆς, avec la note de Jebb 1894 et celle de Kaibel 1896 et, pour le tribraque au second pied, voir Jebb 1887 et Finglass 2018 à *Ced. rex* 537. Une difficulté plus certainement textuelle dépare le passage. Il est en effet impossible que Polynice, tentant de faire céder son père, fasse valoir une seconde fois une faiblesse qui leur est commune, le fait d'être ξένος ou, selon la variante communément rejetée, πτωχός, en opposant, la seconde fois, le cas de son père (δὲ σύ) au cas commun à eux deux (μὲν ἡμεῖς). Polynice doit invoquer une faiblesse propre à Œdipe et qui oppose le fils au père ; cette faiblesse est toute trouvée, c'est l'âge d'Œdipe, sur quoi la tragédie met tellement l'accent : je propose donc πτωχοὶ μὲν ἡμεῖς καὶ ξένοι, γέρον δὲ σύ. Une autre possibilité est, bien sûr, τυφλός. On connaît l'*error Wattianus*, consistant à répéter, de deux mots, celui qu'il ne fallait pas. Ici, le dernier de trois mots s'est vu substituer tantôt le premier tantôt le second.

ὅτ' ἐν πόνῳ

1359 ταὐτῷ βεβηκῶς τυγχάνεις κακῶν ἐμοί.

Les meilleurs critiques refusent ce texte. Il est fastidieux et inutile de citer toutes les conjectures. Deux tendances se font jour. Tournier (1882), Housman 1892 et Viketos 1988 font porter la faute sur κακῶν, qu'ils remplacent respectivement par ἄκων (conjecture purement « paléographique »), ἴσων (sc. τυγχάνεις ; Dawe 1996 renchérit sur Housman en éjectant ἐμοί et en suggérant τυγχάνεις ἴσων κακῶν), κακῶ τ' (ἐν πόνῳ

³⁴ Rapprocher πρὸς θεῶν πατρῶων *Ced. Col.* 756 (Créon) ; *Ant.* 839 (Antigone) ; *Phil.* 933 (Philoctète).

³⁵ Voir Lobeck 1829, 768.

³⁶ Voir, sur ce tour, Lobeck 1829, 277, et, sur les sens respectifs de πάτριος et πατρῶος, Ellendt 1872, 613–615.

ταῦτῳ κακῷ τ' ἐμοί, redondance pénible). Mais la piste la plus prometteuse semble de soupçonner πόνω : Reiske (1753) propose βυθῶ, Bergk (1858) πότμω (que Blaydes 1904 n'améliore pas en lisant ἐμοί κακῶ), F. W. Schmidt (1864) δρόμω, Wecklein 1889 risque ἐν κακῶν... κλυδωνίω en chassant, comme Dawe plus tard, ἐμοί, et Wecklein 1893 lit πίνω, mal inspiré par le célèbre changement de πόνος (Scaliger) en πίνος au v. 1259. Eschyle (*Persae* 600–601) et Euripide (*Medea* 363–364) utilisent la métaphore κλύδων κακῶν (cf. *Œd. rex* 1527 εἰς ὅσον κλύδωνα δεινῆς συμφορᾶς ἐλήλυθεν). La meilleure conjecture publiée que je connaisse est κλόνω,³⁷ qu'admettent Lloyd-Jones–Wilson. Mais non moins en accord avec βεβηκῶς³⁸ et κακῶν (rapprocher la version brachylogique de *El.* 1056–1057, ὅταν γὰρ ἐν κακοῖς | ἤδη βεβήκης) serait peut-être θολῶ, « bourbier », « eau turbide »,³⁹ par extension « trouble », substantif qu'Aristote (fr. 311 Rose, 198 Gigon) utilise dans un passage du *Περὶ ζῶων* au sens de « boue », « eau boueuse » et dont dérive un adjectif qui n'est rien moins que rare et qu'emploient les trois tragiques, θολερός : voir *Aiæx* 205–206 Αἴας θολερῶ κεῖται χειμῶνι νοσήσας (*Scholia uetera* : ἐν παραχώδει ζάλη κεῖται, ὃ ἐστι μανία) ; Euripide *Alc.* 1067 θολοῖ δὲ καρδίαν, « elle me trouble le cœur » ; Hésiode *Op.* 595 ἀθόλωτος à propos de l'eau de source ;⁴⁰ Hésychios θ 628 θολερεῖν· παραχίζεσθαι. L'étymologie⁴¹ et l'utilisation par Aristote, dans d'autres textes que celui évoqué ci-dessus, pour désigner l'encre de la seiche (par ex.) qui trouble l'eau autour d'elle afin d'échapper à son poursuivant, suggèrent que le sens premier est « trouble » (dit d'une matière).

1380 τοιγὰρ τὸ σὸν θάκημα καὶ τοὺς σοὺς θρόνους
κρατοῦσιν, εἴπερ ἐστὶν ἡ παλαίφατος
Δίκη ξύνεδρος Ζηνὸς ἀρχαίοις νόμοις.

³⁷ Martin 1858, 31. Il rapproche 1241 et 1244 (que nous étudions plus bas). Il n'existe aucun exemple où κλόνος, spécialisé à l'époque classique dans un sens militaire ou médical, soit employé comme κλύδων dans κλύδων κακῶν. Voir aussi Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 256.

³⁸ Voir ci-dessus notre note aux vv. 1052–1053.

³⁹ À son propre sujet, Ovide (*Pont.* 4, 2, 17–20) emploie l'expression remarquable *limus malorum* : *Scilicet ut limus uenas excaecat in undis | laesaque suppresso fonte resistit aqua, | pectora sic mea sunt limo uitata malorum | et carmen uena pauperiore fluit.*

⁴⁰ Voir Schulze 1892, 235.

⁴¹ Déjà Benfey 1842, 278 pose *θφολός et rapproche « ahd. *dweran* (...) *uersare*, *confundere*, *miscere* », goth. *dwals*, « dérangé » (allemand *toll*, anglais *dull*), famille que discute, sans en rapprocher θολός mais d'une manière instructive, Pott 1869, 352–353. Voir aussi Schulze 1892, 170.

Œdipe annonce à Polynice que sa malédiction (ἀραι) le poursuivra lui et son frère : οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως πόλιν | κείνην ἐρείψεις, ἀλλὰ πρόσθεν αἵματι | πεσῆ μιανθεῖς χὼ ζύναιμος ἐξ ἴσου (1372–1374, cf. 1384).⁴² Comme l'ont vu presque tous ceux qui ont voulu émender le passage, il faut un futur. On pourrait plaider de façon plus convaincante pour un « présent prophétique » si κρατοῦσιν (« have control of thy 'supplication' and 'thy throne' » Jebb⁴³) s'imposait comme étant le mot juste. Mais – Hartung⁴⁴ le montre bien – ce n'est pas le cas, et l'occurrence de κρατῆσαι v. 1386 (la malédiction empêchera Polynice de s'emparer de Thèbes, γῆς ἐμφυλίου δόρει) suggère la possibilité d'une faute « par anticipation ». Certaines conjectures (ράισουσιν « briseront » Madvig⁴⁵ – la meilleure des corrections publiées –, χρανοῦσιν « souilleront » Blaydes 1859) négligent θάκημα, qui ne désigne pas le trône (ainsi Bellermand 1883), mais – comparer 1160, 1179 – renvoie à la supplication de Poséidon par Polynice en vue du succès de ses entreprises et de l'accession au trône. Hartung, qui explique très bien τὸ σὸν θάκημα καὶ τοὺς σοὺς θρόνους, propose κρανοῦσιν et voit là un sarcasme d'Œdipe (« réaliseront » au lieu de « anéantiront sc. tes espoirs »), mais, si l'on accepte le principe d'une ironie, l'expression (« réaliser ta supplication et ton trône ») est problématique. Nauck (1857) suggère lapidairement κρινοῦσιν, ce qui serait satisfaisant si le sens pouvait être « feront justice de tes prétentions au trône ». Il faut, ce semble, un verbe au futur qui signifie « détruire », « annuler », s'emploie proprement et figurément afin de convenir à θάκημα, *sessio supplicatoria*, et puisse avoir causé la parablepsie à laquelle on doit l'anticipation fautive de κρατῆσαι : je ne vois rien qui satisfasse mieux à tous ces *requisita* que κερῶσι. Dans *Ilias* 8, 7–9, Zeus avertit les dieux de ne pas tenter de réduire sa parole, son ordre, en miettes, d'en annuler l'effet⁴⁶ : μήτε τις οὖν θήλεια θεὸς τό γε μήτε τις ἄρσην | πειράτω διακέρσαι ἐμὸν ἔπος, ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντες | αἰνεῖτ', ὄφρα τάχιστα τελευτήσω τάδε ἔργα. La formule μάχης ἐπὶ μήδεα κείρειν, « couper à la racine

⁴² Dawe 1996 retranche les vv. 1375–1392 par une chirurgie beaucoup trop lourde.

⁴³ Il justifie l'accusatif par le fait qu'il exprime le domaine sur lequel s'étend l'autorité. Selon Radermacher 1909, la construction avec l'accusatif devient usuelle seulement à l'époque hellénistique. Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 256 préfèrent « prevail over » à la traduction de Jebb. Le problème demeure.

⁴⁴ Hartung 1851, 277.

⁴⁵ Madvig 1871, 224 (« dirae non possunt κρατεῖν θρόνους et prauum est praesens tempus pro futuro »).

⁴⁶ Διακέρσαι. Διακόψαι, ἀνατρέψαι (scholie D). Franz Passow, dans le premier tome de la révision (Leipzig 1819) du *Handwörterbuch* de J. G. Schneider, explique *rescindere iussum* (cf. Ovide *Met.* 2, 677–678). Intéressante étude sémantique de la famille et de la racine chez Pott 1869, 149–171.

(*praecidere*), rendre caducs les desseins belliqueux », apparaît deux fois dans l'*Illiade* (15, 467 ; 16, 120⁴⁷). Ces emplois remarquables soutiennent *κεροῦσι τὸ σὸν θάκημα*, « réduiront ta supplication en miettes, annuleront l'effet de ta supplication ». Sophocle emploie le verbe simple à propos d'une forêt abattue (*Trach.* 1196), d'un carnage de bovidés (*Ajax* 55 *πολύκερων φόνον*, accusatif de l'objet interne), d'Astyochè, mère d'Eurypylos occis par Néoptolème, « anéantie » (*Eurypylos* fr.**210, 37 ὃ δαῖμον, ὃ δύσδαιμον, ὃ κείρας [ἐ]μέ, et 46 Radt δαίμων ἔχειρεν ἐν [οὐ : corr. Roberts] δίκᾳ σε, δαίμων).

1390 τοιαῦτ' ἀρῶμαι, καὶ καλῶ τὸ Ταρτάρου
 στυγνὸν πατρῶον ἔρεβος, ὡς σ' ἀποικίση,
 καλῶ δὲ τάσδε δαίμονας, καλῶ δ' Ἄρη
 τὸν σφῶν τὸ δεινὸν μῖσος ἐμβεβληκότα.

1389 τὸ Hermann : τοῦς **zt** : τοῦ cett. || 1390 σ' ΛQ^{pc}**azt** : τ' L : om.
 Q^{ac}RV.

Suite de la malédiction que prononce Œdipe contre Polynice. Jebb expose les quatre grandes lignes d'explication plus ou moins improbables proposées pour le problématique et obscur *πατρῶον*⁴⁸ et plusieurs conjectures, dont τὸ πρῶτον (Bergk, suivi par Dain–Mazon) est à la fois la plus ingénieuse paléographiquement (confusion d'abréviations) et la plus insatisfaisante sous le rapport du sens et du style. Pour ma part, je crois qu'il faut partir de *στυγνὸν*, car, bien que les dieux *στυγέουσι* de tels endroits,⁴⁹ je tiens ce mot pour une corruption probable de Στύγιον (cf. 1563–1564, τὰν παγκευθῆ κάτω νεκρῶν πλάκα | καὶ Στύγιον δόμον), épithète qui convient à Ταρτάρου ἔρεβος,⁵⁰ *Tartari tenebrae* : rapprocher par exemple Eschyle, *Persae* 667–668 Στυγία γὰρ τις ἐπ' ἀχὺς πεπόταται ;⁵¹ Silius Italicus 15, 43, *Decios Stygias Erebi detrusit ad undas*.

⁴⁷ Voir Brügger 2018, 120 (« thwarts/frustrates the plans/strategy for battle »), avec la bibliographie.

⁴⁸ Wilamowitz père chez Wilamowitz fils 1917, 360 défend l'idée que *πατρῶον ἔρεβος* renvoie à l'héritage laissé par Œdipe à son fils. Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 256 approuvent.

⁴⁹ Hésiode, *Theog.* 739 = 810 ≈ *Illiade* 20, 65, avec les remarques de Solmsen 1901, 121 ; West 1966, 363–364 et 2011, 365.

⁵⁰ Sur ce mot, voir West 1997, 153–154 et 159.

⁵¹ Rapproché par Blaydes 1904, qui adopte la correction de Schneidewin. Sur le passage d'Eschyle, voir le commentaire de Garvie 2009, 271–272. Comparer, dans l'*Illiade*, la formule *στυγερός δ' ἄρα μιν σκότος εἶλε* et voir Bekker 1872, 163. « Styx » et *στυγερός* etc. appartiennent à la même famille.

Si cette conjecture évidente originellement proposée par Schneidewin est juste, il suit que *πατρῶν* est gâté, le mot tribraque à finale consonantique appelant un mot à initiale vocalique.⁵² Schneidewin suggère *ἀρωγὸν* (sc. *καλῶ, opitulationis gratia inuoco*), correction à mon avis plus satisfaisante du point de vue de la « paléographie » que de celui du sens. Le sens s'accommoderait mieux de *ἄπειρον*, « sans limite, sans terme »⁵³ : *ἔνθεν τὸν ἄπειρον ἐρεύγονται σκότον | βληχροὶ δνοφερᾶς νυκτὸς ποταμοί*, dit Pindare dans un thrène (fr. 130 Sn.–M.⁵⁴) que connaissait peut-être Sophocle, et on lit chez Aristophane, *Aues* 694–695, *Ἐρέβους δ' ἐν ἀπίροσι κόλποις | τίκτει πρότιστον ὑπηνέμιον Νύξ ἢ μελανόπτερος φόν*.⁵⁵ Il se peut qu'une forme dégradée de *ἄπειρον* ait été prise pour une abréviation de l'élément *πατρ-*.

- 1510 Θη. ἐν τῷ δὲ κεῖσαι τοῦ μόρου τεκμηρίω;
 Οι. αὐτοὶ θεοὶ κήρυκες ἀγγέλλουσί μοι,
 ψεύδοντες οὐδὲν σημάτων προκειμένων.
 Θη. πῶς εἶπας, ὦ γεραιέ, δηλοῦσθαι τάδε;
 Οι. αἱ πολλὰ βρονταὶ διατελεῖς τὰ πολλὰ τε
 1515 στράψαντα χειρὸς τῆς ἀνικῆτου βέλη.

1510 κεῖται σοῦ μόρου τεκμήριον van Delden, recte ut opinor ||
 1512 σῆμα τῶν Dindorf, probabiliter || 1514 αἱ πολλὰ **azt** : αἱ πολλὰι
IrV || 1515 στράψαντα K (coni. Pierson), nisi quod ἀ- in fine
 u. 1514 habet : στρέψαντα cett. : πρέψαντα Housman.

Housman 1892, 167 montre d'une manière non réfutée et irréfutable que la modification de *διατελεῖς* par *πολλὰ* est solécistique et impossible à attribuer à Sophocle. Il suggère *διὰ τε βρονταὶ*, qu'adoptent Lloyd-Jones–Wilson. Il s'agit là d'une conjecture ingénieuse mais, selon toute vraisemblance, fautive (« Housmansche Spielerei », disait Josef Delz dans ces cas-là). En effet, le parallèle des vv. 1510–1511 et la structure des vv. 1513–1515 elle-même suggèrent qu'il faut la troisième personne du pluriel d'un verbe signifiant « montrer », « indiquer ». La conjecture *δηλοῦσι* (premier inventeur J. Reiske) vient spontanément à l'esprit.

⁵² Pour la co-présence de plusieurs résolutions, *Στύγιον* et *ἔρεβος*, dans un trimètre, voir *Æd. rex* 967, avec le commentaire de Finglass 2018, 462.

⁵³ Voir Schulze 1892, 116.

⁵⁴ Voir Wilamowitz 1922, 498–500.

⁵⁵ D'où une des explications proposées pour *πατρῶν*, « primitif » ! Sophocle (*Polyxène* fr. 526 Radt) qualifie au moyen de l'épithète *ἄπειρον*, prise au sens d'« inextricable » (cf. Fraenkel 1950, III, 649–650 à Eschyle, *Ag.* 1382), « das Mordnetz des Klytaemnestra, das Gewand ohne Ende » (Welcker 1839, 178).

La reprise du même verbe donne de la force à la réponse d'Œdipe. Il reste à expliquer la faute : selon Meineke,⁵⁶ αἱ πολλαὶ (la leçon dont αἱ πολλαὶ semble être la normalisation métrique) est une glose de διατελεῖς qui aurait expulsé δηλοῦσι. Une autre explication est au moins possible : l'œil du copiste distrait repasse de δηλοῦσι à δηλοῦσθαι et, au lieu de copier δηλοῦσι, ce même copiste, dont l'œil est redescendu au vers suivant, copie τὰ πολλὰ, qui se trouve en dessous de δηλοῦσθαι et suit un mot pourvu de la même initiale (διατελεῖς) ; cette occurrence fautive de τὰ πολλὰ anticipe la seconde. Puis le substantif βρονταὶ amène la modification de τὰ πολλὰ. L'impossible texte reproduit ci-dessus, qui résulte peut-être de la correction demi-habile de αἱ πολλαὶ, fait encore illusion, notamment auprès des éditeurs français et italiens.

1535 χούτως ἀδῆον τήνδ' ἐνοικήσεις πόλιν
 σπαρτῶν ἀπ' ἀνδρῶν· αἱ δὲ μυρίαὶ πόλεις,
 κἂν εὖ τις οἰκῆ, ραδίως καθύβρισαν.
 θεοὶ γὰρ εὖ μὲν, ὄψε δ' εἰσορῶσ', ὅταν
 τὰ θεῖ' ἀφείς τις ἐς τὸ μαίνεσθαι τραπῆ·
 ὃ μὴ σύ, τέκνον Αἰγέως, βούλου παθεῖν.
 Τὰ μὲν τοιαῦτ' οὖν εἰδὸτ' ἐκδιδάσκομεν.

Si Thésée garde le secret sur son emplacement, l'efficacité talismanique du tombeau d'Œdipe se vérifiera. La divulgation de ce secret, Thésée ne peut pas l'ignorer (εἰδὸτ' ἐκδιδάσκομεν, v. 1539), serait criminelle (τὰ θεῖ' ἀφείς, v. 1537) ;⁵⁷ elle rendrait possible une invasion thébaine d'Athènes.⁵⁸ On voit mal, même en admettant que αἱ μυρίαὶ πόλεις puisse signifier « de nombreuses cités », comment la proposition « nombreuses sont les cités qui, quoique bien gouvernées, sont portées à l'excès » peut s'insérer dans un tel contexte. J'en dis autant de l'interprétation de Jebb, « full many states lightly enter on offence, e'en though their neighbour lives aright ». Hermann 1841 avait compris que la proposition problématique doit être relative à la divulgation du secret,⁵⁹ mais que viennent faire là les

⁵⁶ Meineke 1863, 197.

⁵⁷ Œdipe fait partie des héros qui assurent au territoire où reposent leurs restes une protection suspendue au secret de l'emplacement exact de leur tombe (Lobeck 1829, 281 ; références bibliographiques plus récentes chez Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1997, 133).

⁵⁸ Voir, sur cette notion d'invasion thébaine, Süvern 1828, 15–21. Sophocle n'eut pas à vivre une telle invasion, ce qui fit dire à Wilamowitz père chez Wilamowitz fils 1917, 371, se mettant à la place du poète vieux : « Nur die Götter bleiben stät : sie schirmen Kolonos und Athen ».

⁵⁹ Voir Süvern 1828, 13–14.

« innombrables cités » ? Wecklein 1889 voit la difficulté et suggère οἱ δὲ μυριοί πόλεως, mais l'insolence de la multitude est hors sujet : l'insolence pertinente est celle des divulgateurs de secrets. Cette divulgation est la marque de la folie (τὸ μαίνεσθαι, v. 1537), et, en conjecturant αἱ δὲ μωρίας πλέαι, Blaydes 1859 mit sur la bonne voie Jebb, presque malgré lui, car il écarte sa propre suggestion, οἱ δὲ μωρίας πλέω. Par chance, Sophocle lui-même vient à la rescousse, car voici comment Teucer s'exprime en répondant à Ménélas dans *Aïax* 1150–1151 : ἐγὼ δὲ γ' ἄνδρ' ὄπωπα μωρίας πλέων, | ὅς ἐν κακοῖς ὕβριζε τοῖσι τῶν πέλας ; « et moi j'ai vu un homme rempli de déraison qui se montrait outreucidant au milieu des malheurs des autres ». Là, à un fou est contreposé l'ensemble formé par « les autres » ; ici, aux fous capables de divulguer des secrets sacrés est opposée la cité (πόλις τις, οὐ πόλις est repris du v. 1553) bien gouvernée : même si une cité est bien gouvernée, il y a toujours des fous pour oser le sacrilège en comptant sur les délais de la punition divine. Jebb suggère que Sophocle pense à la parodie divulgatoire⁶⁰ des Mystères (cf. vv. 1050–1053⁶¹) et à la profanation perpétrée par les Hermocopides :⁶² voilà qui éclairerait d'un surcroît de lumière la restitution de Jebb, qu'il écarte et

⁶⁰ Voir Lobeck 1829, 48–49 et 61–62.

⁶¹ Diverses restrictions d'accès (cf. Lobeck 1829, 271) conditionnent l'initiation qu'évoquent les vers souvent cités de Sophocle, fr. 837 Pearson et Radt, ὡς τρισόλβιοι | κείνοι βροτῶν, οἱ ταῦτα δερχθέντες τέλη | μόλωσ' ἐς Ἄιδου· τοῖσδε γὰρ μόνοις ἐκεῖ | ζῆν ἔστι, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἔχειν (ἔχειν Pearson, avec raison : ἐκεῖ Plutarque ou ses mss., « faute par persévérance » manifeste) κακά. Deux retouches paraissent nécessaires : (1) κακά semble appeler son contraire εὖ, d'où ζῆν εὖ 'στι (sur cette aphérèse, voir Bekker 1863, 174 ; West 1998, XXXIV) ; (2) πάντα dans πάντ' ἔχειν κακά ne convient guère : il faudrait, je crois, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἅπαντ' ἔχειν κακά (cf. *Aïax* 1187–1188 ἅπαν[σ]τον ἅταν). La forme correcte est ἅπαντος, non ἅπανστος : voir Riemann 1885, 89 ; West 1998, XLIV. Il ne semble y avoir, à moins qu'on n'admette ἅπαντα, de césure que trihémimère, comme dans *Aïax* 1091 ; *Ant.* 1021 ; fr. 670, 1 Radt. Mais en réalité il y a césure avant élision faite (voir Descroix 1931, 255), ζῆν ἔστι, τοῖς δὲ, comme dans *Æd. rex* 856, κατέκταν', ἀλλ' αὐτὸς πάροιθεν ὄλετο (possible césure « avant crase faite » dans *Aïax* 855, καίτοι σὲ μὲν κάκει προσασθήσω ξυνών). En l'absence totale de penthémimère et en présence d'une fin de mot après le troisième pied, soit le premier mot du second hémistiche est tétrasyllabique ou pentasyllabique soit le second hémistiche est fait d'un unique mot hexasyllabique (fr. 670, 1) : c'est ce que je conclus de la liste imparfaite que dresse Schmidt 1865, 24 (ajouter fr. 670, 1 Radt). Le vers 598 de l'*Æd. rex* τὸ γὰρ τυχεῖν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντ' (v. l. ἅπαν) ἐνταῦθ' ἔνι, ferait exception, mais Schmidt y admet l'élision αὐτοῖς(ι) – c'est à tort (cf. Wilamowitz 1916, 10) que les éditeurs éliminent de la poésie ces formes longues élidées –, tandis que, comme de nombreux autres et au premier chef G. Hermann, Finglass 2018, 360 défend une variante (r), τὸ γὰρ τυχεῖν αὐτοῖσι πᾶν ἐνταῦθ' ἔνι.

⁶² L'idée de Jebb n'est pas reprise chez Vickers 2008, qui consacre le chapitre VII à l'*Ædipe à Colone*.

que nous défendons. En éliminant les vv. 1534–1538, Dawe 1996 soigne une foulure en retranchant le genou.

ὦ φῶς ἀφεγγές, πρόσθε πού ποτ' ἦσθ' ἐμόν,
1549 νῦν δ' ἔσχατόν σου τοῦμόν ἄπτται δέμας.

Œdipe apostrophe la lumière qui ne brille pas pour lui en opposant le passé, où elle « était sienne » et le présent, car il va mourir et c'est la dernière fois qu'il ressent la lumière, sans la voir. Peu satisfait par le texte transmis, Nauck suggère de comprendre et de lire (« vielleicht », dit-il laconiquement), ὦ φῶς, ἀφεγγές πρόσθε πού ποτ' ἦσθ' ἐμοί, correction très mauvaise.⁶³ Elle implique en effet que la lumière luit pour Œdipe « à présent », et le contraste entre « auparavant je ne voyais pas tes rayons » et « maintenant je te ressens pour la dernière fois » est très insatisfaisant. Cette conjecture a néanmoins le mérite d'attirer l'attention sur ἦσθ' ἐμόν, qui paraît exprimer d'une manière inadéquate l'idée que, dans le passé, Œdipe percevait la lumière continûment. *O lux illumina eras penes me olim integra, ac nunc te extremum apiscitur corpus meum*, glose élégamment Reisig,⁶⁴ gommant une opposition très marquée entre le passé où Œdipe percevait la lumière continûment, soit qu'il la vît de ses yeux soit qu'il en ressentît la chaleur, et le présent où il la ressent pour la dernière fois. Il y a dans le texte transmis une difficulté, que semble corroborer le caractère peu justifié de la particule που ici. Wunder 1839 allègue le v. 580, χρόνω μάθοις ἄν, οὐχὶ τῷ παρόντι που, mais là, si πω (Schäfer) est rejeté à juste titre, la particule που se justifie : « non à présent, je présume », dit Œdipe, car, ainsi que remarque Jebb, le signal divin n'ayant pas encore été donné, Œdipe est fondé à conjecturer que le terme de sa vie n'est pas pour tout de suite. La locution incriminée ἦσθ' ἐμόν laisse encore pour ainsi dire reconnaître le mot juste, ἦσθόμην, qui appelle σου en lieu et place de που : ὦ φῶς ἀφεγγές, πρόσθε σού ποτ' ἦσθόμην. Ce type d'aoriste bien nommé *complexivus sive summarius*⁶⁵ indique une action, un état prolongés et

⁶³ Voir Meineke 1863, 198.

⁶⁴ Reisig 1823, CLXXXV. Jebb 1889 cite « *Par. Lost.* 3. 21, Thee I revisit safe, | And feel thy sovran vital lamp ; but thou | Revisit'st not these eyes » et « *Lear* 4. I. 23, Might I but live to see thee *in my touch*, | I'd say I had eyes again » (c'est Jebb qui souligne).

⁶⁵ Sobolewski 1890, 25 (*summarius*, d'où, je suppose, l'inquiétant « totalitär » chez Schwyzer–Debrunner 1950, 261) et Sobolewski 1891, 12. Selon Lloyd 1979, 83, l'appellation « aoriste complexif » est mal choisie parce que ce qu'il nomme « aspect complexif » (« complete action ») diffère. Mais « complexif » (*complector*, en opposition à *compleo*) paraît désigner de manière plus appropriée le regroupement que l'achèvement.

révolus ou – fait trop souvent négligé – une action répétée et révolue, « diutinam actionem, tamquam in unum contractam »;⁶⁶ il équivaut, dans ce dernier cas, à « l'imparfait perfectif » qui évoque la même chose sous l'aspect de la durée où s'étale l'ensemble des actes.⁶⁷ L'étymologie (αἰσ-θ-, « rendre manifeste, évident »⁶⁸) explique l'emploi de αἰσθάνομαι au sens général de « percevoir » – « voir », avec l'accusatif, dans *Phil.* 75 ὥστ' εἶ με τόξων ἐγκρατῆς αἰσθήσεται. Le latin *audio* a la même étymologie et la même formation (*au-d-*) mais s'applique à un champ de perception moins large. Sophocle construit aussi avec le génitif αἰσθάνομαι (cf. *El.* 683–684 ὄτ' ἦσθετ' ἀνδρὸς ὀρθίων γηρυμάτων | δρόμον προκηρύξαντος) et ἐπαισθάνομαι (cf. *Ed. Col.* 1351 οὗ τᾶν ποτ' ὀμφῆς τῆς ἐμῆς ἐπήσθετο). Je tiens pour possible que le dramaturge se soit souvenu d'un passage

⁶⁶ Sobolewski 1891, 34. Voir *Ajax* 502 ; *El.* 1145 ; Moorhouse 1982, 193–194 ; Schmidt 1845, 78 (avec référence suggestive à Thucydide 3, 54, 5 et trompeuse à *Trach.* 1074, dont le texte est douteux) ; Herbig 1896, 209 (« da der Aorist, insbesondere der konstatierende, durchhaus nicht immer momentan sein muss, so kann er auch zum Ausdruck des durativ-perfektiven Aktionsart benützt werden (ἐβασίλευσε τριάκοντα ἔτη) ») ; Delbrück 1897, 237 (« ponctualisation » d'actions que l'imparfait exprime linéairement) ; Kühner–Gerth 1898, 155 (« *aoristus complexivus* oder konzentrierender Aorist ») ; Metzler 1904–1905, 233 et 275–276 ; Stahl 1907, 128–130 (ne distingue pas l'activité ou l'état prolongés et l'action répétée et critique l'appellation « complexif ») ; Kluge 1911, 22–50 (excellente dissertation dirigée par W. Schulze ; chapitre II *de sententiis iterativis*) ; Schwyzer–Debrunner 1950, 261–262 (« faktiver Aorist », l'appellation « complexif » n'étant pour Schwyzer qu'un artifice destiné à combler le fossé entre aoriste ponctuel et aoriste constatif : Lloyd 1979, 83 fait aussi fond sur cette valeur constative) ; Ruipérez 1982, 77 et ailleurs. Ruipérez n'envisage que l'activité ou l'état prolongés. L'aoriste indiquant l'action répétée dans le passé passe aussi entre les mailles du filet de Willi 2018. Emde Boas–Rijksbaron–Huitink–Bakker 2019, 418 gardent, eux, l'appellation « complexive aorist » sans davantage évoquer l'action répétée dans le passé.

⁶⁷ Selon Westphal 1873a, 351, « Der Aorist ist (...) am nächsten mit dem Imperfectum verwandt, von dem er sich dadurch unterscheidet, dass das Imperfectum eine Handlung der Vergangenheit ausdrückt, welche zu der Zeit, von welcher ich rede, noch nicht zu ihrem Abschlusse gekommen, noch nicht fertig war, wogegen die Handlung der Vergangenheit durch den Aorist ausgedrückt wird, wenn ich sie als eine solche hinstelle, welche in der Zeit, von welcher ich rede, zum vollen Schlusse gekommen ist ». De cet étroit point de vue, l'aoriste est plus propre que l'imparfait à exprimer la répétition dans le passé d'une action accomplie. Il n'est peut-être pas inutile de se souvenir de la thèse (cf. Nölting 1843, 23 et 35–36 et Westphal 1873b, 58 et 99) selon laquelle ἦν et *eram* sont des aoristes. Exprimer la répétition dans le passé d'une action accomplie est pourtant un des emplois de l'imparfait grec (cf. Delbrück 1897 et Kluge 1911 *loc. cit.* ; Moorhouse 1982, 188–189 et Willi 2018, 180) et latin, pour ne pas parler du français.

⁶⁸ Voir de Vaan 2008, 61 s. v. *audio* en comparant Pott 1861, 472 ; 1867a, 440–441 et 1867b, 650.

remarquable d'une pièce d'Euripide représentée en 428, l'*Hippolyte porte-couronne*, 1391–1392 ὦ θεῖον ὄσμηξ πνεῦμα· καὶ γὰρ ἐν κακοῖς | ὦν ἡσθόμην σου κἀνεκουφίσθην δέμας. Hippolyte entend, sent mais ne voit pas sa divine protectrice.⁶⁹

1605 ἐπεὶ δὲ παντὸς εἶχε δρῶντος ἡδονήν
 κοῦκ ἦν ἔτ' οὐδὲν ἀργὸν ὧν ἐφίετο,
 κτύπησε μὲν Ζεὺς χθόνιος, αἰ δὲ παρθένοι
 ῥίγησαν, ὡς ἦκουσαν·

Le messager décrit les préparatifs d'Œdipe et de ses filles en vue de son imminent passage dans un autre monde. Ce que Blaydes (1904) écrivait à propos du v. 1604 paraît toujours vrai : « Locus nondum sanatus. Dindorfius reddit 'cum omni in re satisfactum esset'. Et hunc quidem sensum requiri non dubitari potest, sed codicum lectio id significare non potest ». On sait depuis longtemps et Housman⁷⁰ rappelle très bien que δρῶντος ne saurait signifier « activity » (et par extension « service ») que substantivé par l'article défini (τὸ δρῶν). Les conjectures que Jebb et Blaydes citent sont très violentes et/ou insatisfaisantes du point de vue du sens. La correction brillante de Shilleto et Meineke,⁷¹ ἐπεὶ δὲ παντὸς εἶχ' ἔρωτος ἡδονήν, « comme il avait satisfaction dans tous ses désirs »,⁷² fait exception et mérite sûrement d'être cité ; elle mérite peut-être plus si l'on admet qu'une mécoupure aussi facile à corriger que εἶχε *ρωτος ait suffi à amener la correction obscure δρῶντος. Lloyd-Jones–Wilson lisent ἐπεὶ δὲ πᾶσαν ἔσχε δρῶντος ἡδονήν, « when he had got all the pleasure belonging to a doer » (Lloyd-Jones 1994), ce qui semble peu satisfaisant sous le rapport de la phraséologie et même du sens (Œdipe ordonne et ses filles exécutent), bien que la restitution de l'aoriste puisse paraître heureuse. Mais l'imparfait se défend.⁷³ Je partage l'opinion selon laquelle

⁶⁹ Voir Barrett 1974, 409.

⁷⁰ Housman 1892, 140.

⁷¹ Meineke 1863, 203, que précéda de quelques années R. Shilleto (voir Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 262 et 1997, 135).

⁷² Phraséologie particulière et très resserrée, obscure sans l'éclairage du vers suivant. On trouve le substantif avec le génitif chez Euripide, *El.* 596–597, φίλας μὲν ἡδονὰς ἀσπασμάτων | ἔχω, mais dans un sens banal, « j'ai le plaisir amical de votre accueil ».

⁷³ « 'Eye-witness' imperfect », selon Moorhouse 1982, 189–190. Du même emploi relève Euripide, *Iph. Taur.* 953–954 ἐς δ' ἄγγος ἴδιον ἴσον ἅπασι Βακχίου | μέτρημα πληρώσαντες εἶχον ἡδονήν (« ils prenaient du bon temps »). Mais Jebb a raison de critiquer l'imparfait que contient la conjecture, certes ingénieuse, de Mekler 1885 adoptée par Dawe 1996, ἐπεὶ δὲ πάνθ' ὅσ' εἶπ' ἔδρων πρὸς ἡδονήν.

le sens requis est celui qu'exprime Dindorf en latin et je tente à mon tour de résoudre cette *crux* célèbre. Je pars de l'hypothèse que δρῶντος s'est substitué à un substantif de la même famille mais rarissime, non attesté en dehors de la lexicographie et qui, je suppose, ne fut pas compris par le diorthote de Sophocle : Hésychios δ 2317 δράνος (lire δρᾶνος⁷⁴)· ἔργον. πρᾶξις. ὄργανον. ἄγαλμα. κατασκευάσμα. δύναμις. La correction fautive de δρᾶνος en δρῶντος a, je suppose, amené le diorthote à adapter le texte ; je suggère que le texte original fut ἐπεὶ δὲ πᾶν πρὸς (ou πρὸς πᾶν) εἶχε δρᾶνος ἡδονήν, « comme il avait satisfaction relativement à⁷⁵ chaque opération ». L'intercalation du verbe conjugué se trouve même en prose, Xénophon, *De re publica Lacedaemoniorum* 2, 5, εὐχερέστερον δὲ πρὸς πᾶν ἔχειν βρῶμα.⁷⁶

ὡς δὲ πρὸς τέλος
 γόων ἀφίκοντ' οὐδ' ἔτ' ὠρώρει βοή,
 ἦν μὲν σιωπῇ, φθέγμα δ' ἐξαίφνης τινὸς
 θώυξεν αὐτόν, ὥστε πάντας ὀρθίας
 1625 στήσαι φόβῳ δείσαντας ἐξαίφνης τρίχας·

Un messager décrit les derniers moments d'Œdipe. Il est peu douteux que la seconde occurrence de ἐξαίφνης soit une « faute par persévérance » et Lloyd-Jones–Wilson adoptent la conjecture de Dindorf εὐθέως. Mais cet adverbe a l'air d'une cheville et ne fournit pas de point d'appui formel à la « persévérance ». La locution ἐξ ἄκρας « depuis la racine » est exempte de ces défauts. Elle n'apparaît que chez Bianor, *AP* 9, 259, 1 = 10, 1 Gow-Page, Ἥριπεν ἐξ ἄκρης δόμος ἀθρόος, mais la locution κατ' ἄκρης, *funditus* (cf. Hésychios κ 1186, κατ' ἄκρης· κατὰ κορυφῆς. κατὰ κρατός), est chez Homère et Hérodote, et Sophocle a κατ' ἄκρας écrit en deux mots ou un seul (v. 1242 [κατὰ κρᾶς Wilamowitz⁷⁷] ; *Ant.* 201).

⁷⁴ Sur ce substantif, voir Pott 1867a, 136.

⁷⁵ Sur cette signification de πρὸς, voir Ellendt 1872, 662 a § 6. Ni προτί ni son avatar πρὸς (cf. Schulze 1892, 270) ne se trouve chez Homère dans ce sens, qui est attesté pour védique *prāti* (cf. Delbrück 1893, 728) et, si je ne m'abuse, apparaît en attique, chez Thucydide et Sophocle.

⁷⁶ Pour cette intercalation et le placement de la préposition, voir Pearson 1917, 334 s. v. « preposition » ; Moorhouse 1982, 94–95. Sur la coupe après la préposition monosyllabique (πᾶν πρὸς), normalement précédée d'un monosyllabe, voir Descroix 1931, 283–284.

⁷⁷ Wilamowitz 1891, 238 et Wilamowitz 1921, 256 n. 1. West 2017 aurait dû mentionner la même correction de Wilamowitz dans *Odys.* 5, 313 ὡς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντ' ἔλασεν μέγα κῦμα κατ' ἄκρης. L'étude bien connue de Leumann 1950, 56–58 sur κατ' ἄκρης / κατὰ κρήθεν ignore les propositions de Wilamowitz.

ὁ δ', ὡς ἀνὴρ γενναῖος, οὐκ οἴκτου μέτα
κατήνεσεν τάδ' ὄρκιος δράσειν ξένῳ.
1638 ὅπως δὲ ταῦτ' ἔδρασεν, εὐθὺς Οἰδίπους
ψάσας ἀμαυραῖς χερσὶν ὧν παίδων λέγει...

1636 ὄκνου Bothe, recte ut opinor.

Thésée promet à Œdipe de faire ce que ce dernier lui a demandé. Comme Thésée ne peut accomplir que dans le futur ce qu'il a promis, il faut rapporter ταῦτ' ἔδρασεν (v. 1638) non à la réalisation de la promesse mais à l'énonciation de la promesse elle-même, « but when Theseus had so promised » (Jebb), ce qui est extrêmement gauche. L'alternative, qui consiste à faire d'Œdipe le sujet du verbe ἔδρασεν, prête à Sophocle une maladresse non moins grande. Il y a lieu de soupçonner une « faute par persévérance ». Les mots auxquels ταῦτ' ἔδρασεν semblent s'être substitués peuvent être ταῦτ' ἐπώμοσ(ε). Sophocle emploie ὄμνυμι, διόμνυμι, ἐξόμνυμι, ἐπώμοτος, et vraisemblablement ἐπομνύς (Pearson), non ὑπομνύς dans les *Colchides* fr. 339 Pearson et Radt ainsi que ἐπώμοσα dans un fragment (285 Pearson et Radt) corrompu de l'*Inachos*.

δράσω καὶ τάδε καὶ πάνθ' ὀπόσ' ἄν
μέλλω πράσσειν πρόσφορά θ' ὑμῖν
1775 καὶ τῷ κατὰ γῆς, ὅς νέον ἔρρει,
πρὸς χάριν· οὐ δεῖ μ' ἀποκάμνειν.

1173 ὀπόσ' ἄν Porson : ὄσ' uel ὄσα codd. || 1176 οὐ δεῖ Hermann : οὐ γὰρ δεῖ codd.

Dans un système anapestique, Thésée renouvelle à Antigone la promesse qu'il fit à Œdipe quand ce dernier lui demanda ceci : καὶ καταίνεσον | μήποτε προδώσειν τάσδ' ἐκόν, τελεῖν δ' ὅσ' ἄν | μέλλης φρονῶν εὖ ξυμφέροντ' αὐταῖς ἀεί (1633–1635). Les éditeurs qui, comme Lloyd-Jones–Wilson, introduisent une ponctuation forte devant οὐ δεῖ μ' ἀποκάμνειν conçoivent cette proposition comme étant en asyndète et juxtaposition avec ce qui précède. Cette asyndète a très justement⁷⁸ choqué le diorthote ou le copiste qui ajouta γὰρ sans se rendre compte qu'il faussait le mètre. Mais il faut construire autrement : καὶ τάδε δράσω (Blaydes 1859 corrige ainsi l'ordre des mots transmis) καὶ οὐ δεῖ μ' ἀποκάμνειν (sc. πράσσειν) πάνθ' ὀπόσ' ἄν μέλλω πράσσειν πρόσφορά θ' ὑμῖν καὶ τῷ κατὰ γῆς, ὅς νέον ἔρρει, πρὸς χάριν, « non seulement je ferai ce que tu dis mais je dois ne pas

⁷⁸ Voir, contre Lloyd-Jones–Wilson 1990, 266, Dawe 2002–2003, 8.

avoir de cesse que de faire ce que je suis résolu à faire d'utile à vous deux et d'agréable à celui qui, récemment parti, se trouve sous terre ». Pour l'infinifatif avec ἀποκάμνειν, on cite Euripide, *Ion* 135. Dans la foulée de van Herwerden, Blaydes⁷⁹ soupçonne πράσσειν, qui ne se trouve pas dans les vers (1633–1635) que notre passage reprend, d'être une interpolation. Il serait, même avec la construction que je prône, possible de se passer de πράσσειν en sous-entendant, à partir de δράσω, l'infinifatif δρᾶν.⁸⁰ On supposerait alors que πράσσειν s'est substitué à ce qui répondrait à φρονῶν εὔ (v. 1635) et qui pourrait être πρ<όφ|ρω>ν (*El.* 1380 ; fr. 1131**, 7 Radt⁸¹). On obtiendrait, au total, un style certes dense et complexe mais tout à fait sophocléen. Hermann 1841 l'avait bien senti, qui, de surcroît, supposait un changement de construction acrobatique : « incepta est oratio sic, ut καὶ πάντα pendere debeat e verbo δράσω, sed, de quo genere saepe monitum est, iterat deinde apodosin, construens καὶ πάντα οὐ δεῖ μ' ἀποκάμνειν, scilicet δρᾶν, quod latet in δράσω ». L'ordre restauré καὶ τάδε δράσω (Blaydes mais aussi Mekler 1885) dispense de cette explication et rend toute sa force au balancement καί... καί.

Gauthier Liberman

Paris, École Pratique des Hautes Études ;
Bordeaux, Université Michel de Montaigne
gauthier.liberman@orange.fr

Bibliographie

- G. Avezzi, G. Guidorizzi, G. Cerri, *Sofocle. Edipo a Colono* (Milan 2008).
C. Badham, *Platonis Euthydemus et Laches* (Iéna–Londres 1865).
W. S. Barrett, *Euripides. Hippolytos* (Oxford 1974).
I. Bekker, *Homerische Blätter I–II* (Bonn 1863–1872).
L. Bellermann, *Sophokles, Oidipus auf Kolonos für den Schulgebrauch erklärt* (Leipzig 1883).
T. F. Benedict, *Observationes in Sophoclis septem tragoediis* (Leipzig 1820).
T. Benfey, *Griechisches Wurzellexikon II* (Berlin 1842).
F. H. M. Blaydes, *Sophocles, with English Notes I* (Londres 1859).
F. H. M. Blaydes, *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus, denuo recensuit et brevi annotatione critica instruxit* (Halle 1904).
M. Bréal, “Les commencements du verbe”, *MSL* 11 (1900) 268–284.

⁷⁹ Blaydes 1904, 116.

⁸⁰ Le verbe ἀποκάμνω se construit aussi avec l'accusatif (on cite πόνον μηδένα ἀποκάμνειν chez Xénophon, *Hell.* 7, 5, 19) et Jebb rattache πάντα à ἀποκάμνειν.

⁸¹ Pour l'absence de *correptio Attica*, voir Rumpel 1866, 10.

- C. Brügger, *Homer's Iliad. The Basel Commentary. Book XVI* (Boston–Berlin 2018).
- K. Brugmann, *Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes im Indogermanischen* (Berlin–Leipzig 1925).
- F. Chamoux, “Épigramme de Cyrène en l’honneur du roi Magas”, *BCH* 82 (1958) 571–587.
- A. Dain, P. Mazon, *Sophocle. Tragédies III* (Paris ⁵1999).
- A. M. Dale, *Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses, Fasc. 2, Aeolo-Choriambic* (Londres 1981).
- R. D. Dawe, *Sophocles. Oedipus Coloneus* (Leipzig ³1996).
- R. D. Dawe, “On Editing Sophocles, Oxford Style”, *ICS* 27–28 (2002–2003) 1–19.
- B. Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen I–II* (Strasbourg 1893–1897).
- J. Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique* (Macon 1931).
- W. Dindorf, *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus* (Oxford ³1860).
- W. Dindorf, *Sophoclis tragoediae* (Oxford ⁴1870).
- F. Ellendt, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (Berlin ²1872).
- E. van Emde Boas, A. Rijksbaron, L. Huitink, M. de Bakker, *The Cambridge Grammar of Ancient Greek* (Cambridge 2019).
- P. J. Finglass, *Sophocles. Oedipus the King* (Cambridge 2018).
- E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950).
- P. Friedländer, *Studien zur antiken Literatur und Kunst* (Berlin 1969).
- A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus. Persae* (Oxford 2009).
- M. Griffith, *Sophocles. Antigone* (Cambridge ²2000).
- J. A. Hartung, *Sophokles' Oidipus auf Kolonos* (Leipzig 1851).
- A. Heimer, *Studia Pindarica* (Lund 1883–1884).
- G. Herbig, “Aktionsart und Zeitstufe. Beiträge zur Funktionslehre des idg. Verbums”, *IF* 6 (1896) 157–269.
- G. Hermann, *Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide* (Leipzig 1831).
- G. Hermann, *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus* (Leipzig ²1841).
- H. van Herwerden, *Pindarica* (Leipzig 1882).
- T. F. Higham, C. M. Bowra, *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation* (Oxford 1938).
- E. Housman, “The Oedipus Coloneus of Sophocles”, *AJPh* 13 (1892) 139–170 (= *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman I* [Cambridge 1972] 181–208).
- A. E. Housman, “Pearson’s Sophocles”, *CR* 39 (1925) 76–80.
- R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments, Part I. The Oedipus Tyrannus* (Cambridge ²1887).
- R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments, Part II. The Oedipus Coloneus* (Cambridge 1889).
- R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments, Part VI. The Electra* (Cambridge 1894).
- G. Kaibel, *Sophokles. Elektra* (Leipzig 1896).
- O. Kern, “Zum Sakrament der eleusinischen Mysterien”, *ARW* 19 (1916–1919) 433–435.

- H. Kluge, *Syntaxis Graecae quaestiones selectae* (Berlin 1911).
- R. Kühner, B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Satzlehre I* (Hannovre–Leipzig 1898).
- Colonel Leake, *Die Demen von Attika*, trad. A. Westermann (Braunschweig 1847).
- K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homericis* (Leipzig ³1882).
- M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Bâle 1950).
- A. L. Lloyd, *Anatomy of the Verb* (Amsterdam 1979).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea. Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Oxford 1990).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclis fabulae* (Oxford ²1992).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, *Sophocles. Antigone, Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonos* (Cambridge Mass. – Londres 1994).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, N. G. Wilson, *Sophocles : Second Thoughts* (Göttingen 1997).
- C. A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (Königsberg 1829).
- N. Madvig, *Adversaria I* (Copenhagen 1871).
- J. Mähly, “Zu Sophokles”, *Philologus* 18 (1862) 360–362.
- J. F. Martin, *De aliquot locis Aeschyli Supplicum et Sophoclis tragoediarum* (Posen 1858).
- A. Meineke, *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus cum scholiis antiquis* (Berlin 1863).
- S. Mekler, *Sophoclis tragoediae ex recensione G. Dindorfii* (Leipzig ⁶1885).
- H. Metzler, “Zur Lehre von den Aktionen, bes. im Griechischen”, *IF* 16 (1904–1905) 186–277.
- A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leyde 1982).
- T. Nölting, *Über den genetischen Zusammenhang des Aoristus II. mit dem Perfectum II. der griechischen Sprache* (Wismar 1843).
- A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles III* (Cambridge 1917).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen II 1* (Lemgo–Detmold ²1861).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen II 2/1* (Detmold ²1867a).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen II 2/2* (Detmold ²1867b).
- A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen II 3* (Detmold ²1869).
- L. Radermacher, *Sophokles, erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck, Drittes Bändchen: Oidipus auf Kolonos. Neunte Auflage. Neue Bearbeitung* (Berlin 1909).
- K. Reisig, *Commentationes criticae de Sophoclis Oedipo Coloneo* (Iéna 1822).
- K. Reisig, *Commentarii in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum* (Iéna 1823).
- O. Riemann, “Le dialecte attique d’après les inscriptions”, *RPh* 9 (1885) 49–99.
- F. Ritschl, *De cantico Sophocleo Oedipi Colonei* (Bonn 1862).
- M. S. Ruipérez, *Structure du système des aspects et des temps du verbe en grec ancien* (Besançon 1982).
- J. Rumpel, *Quaestiones metricae II* (Insterburg 1866).
- A. Schmidt, *De caesura media in Graecorum trimetro iambico* (Bonn 1865).
- H. Schmidt, *Der Griechische Aorist* (Halle 1845).
- O. Schroeder, *Grundriss der griechischen Versgeschichte* (Heidelberg 1930).

- W. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae* (Gütersloh 1892).
- W. Schulze, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1934).
- E. Schwyzer, A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik II* (Munich 1950).
- S. Sobolewski, *De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo* (Moscou 1890).
- S. Sobolewski, *Syntaxis Aristophaneae capita selecta* (Moscou 1891).
- F. Solmsen, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre* (Strasbourg 1901).
- J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen verbums der klassischen Zeit* (Heidelberg 1907).
- J. W. Süvern, “Die Absicht und Zeit des Oidipus auf Kolonos”, *Abh. Königl. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (1828) 1–48.
- M. de Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages* (Leyde–Boston 2008).
- M. Vickers, *Sophocles and Alcibiades* (Londres – New York 2008).
- E. Viketos, “Sophocles Oedipus Coloneus 1358-59”, *Hermes* 116 (1988) 256.
- J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax I* (Bâle²1926).
- N. Wecklein, *Sophoclis tragoediae, recensuit et explanavit E. Wunder. Vol. I. Sect. III, continens Oedipum Coloneum. Editio quinta, quam curavit N. Wecklein* (Leipzig 1889).
- N. Wecklein, *Die Tragödien des Sophokles zum Schulgebrauche, Fünftes Bändchen, Ödipus in Kolonos* (Munich²1893).
- F. G. Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyklus I* (Bonn 1839).
- M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony* (Oxford 1966).
- M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford 1997).
- M. L. West, *Aeschylus tragoediae* (Stuttgart²1998).
- M. L. West, *The Making of the Iliad* (Oxford 2011).
- M. L. West, *Homerus. Odyssea* (Berlin–Boston 2017).
- R. Westphal, *Das indogermanische Verbum* (Iéna 1873a).
- R. Westphal, *Die Verbal-Flexion der lateinischen Sprache* (Iéna 1873b).
- R. Westphal, *Allgemeine Metrik der indogermanischen und semitischen Völker* (Berlin 1892).
- T. von Wilamowitz, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Berlin 1917).
- U. von Wilamowitz, *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Berlin 1886).
- U. von Wilamowitz, *Euripides. Hippolytos griechisch und deutsch* (Berlin 1891).
- U. von Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin 1916).
- U. von Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin 1921).
- U. von Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922).
- U. von Wilamowitz, *Griechische Tragoedien, vierter Band* (Berlin 1923).
- A. Willi, *Origins of the Greek Verb* (Cambridge 2018).
- C. W. Willink, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Leyde–Boston 2010).
- E. Wunder, *Sophoclis tragoediae, recensuit et explanavit E. W. Vol. I. Sect. III, continens Oedipum Coloneum* (Gotha–Erfurt 1839).

This two-part paper, one of a forthcoming series of “Sophoclea” or “*Sophocleuncula”, deals with not a few difficult passages of this poet’s last tragedy Oedipus at Colonus and is meant by its author to contribute to reconsidering the numerous exegetical and critical issues which the text of this unduly neglected drama raises. In this second part an emendation of the famous “Eleusinian” fragment 837 Radt is also suggested.

В этой двухчастной статье, входящей в серию “Sophoclea”, или “*Sophocleuncula”, разбираются многочисленные сложные пассажи последней трагедии Софокла “Эдип в Колоне”. Автор вносит свой вклад в решение многочисленных проблем экзегезы и критики текста этой драмы, которой незаслуженно уделяется недостаточно внимания. Во второй части разбирается также знаменитый “элевсинский” фрагмент (fr. 837 Radt).

Walter Lapini

LA CHIAMARONO AMPLESSO RUBATO
(EURIPIDE, *ELENA* 22)*

Ai vv. 16–23 dell’*Elena* di Euripide, Elena si presenta così:¹

ἡμῖν δὲ γῆ μὲν πατρὶς οὐκ ἀνώνυμος
Σπάρτη, πατὴρ δὲ Τυνδάρεως· ἔστι<v> δὲ δῆ²
λόγος τις ὡς Ζεὺς μητέρ’ ἔπτατ’ εἰς ἐμὴν
Λήδαν κύκνου μορφώματ’ ὄρνιθος λαβών,
ὄς δόλιον εὐνήν ἐξέπραξ’ ὑπ’ αἰετοῦ 20
δίωγμα φεύγων, εἰ σαφῆς οὗτος λόγος·
Ἐλένη δ’ ἐκλήθη. ἃ δὲ πεπόνθαμεν κακὰ
λέγοιμ’ ἄν. ἦλθον τρεῖς θεαὶ κτλ.

Colpisce il v. 21: «se questo λόγος è vero».³ I manuali, e la letteratura che ne dipende, evincono dallo strano dubbio (come può Elena stessa esprimere riserve sulla sua nascita?) una critica alla tradizione: Euripide non crede più ai miti che racconta e trasmette distacco e scetticismo anche ai personaggi che fa parlare *loco sui*.⁴ Elena torna ad accennare al λόγος

* Queste pagine si sono molto giovate dell’aiuto di Alessandro Parenti, di Alexander Verlinsky e dei revisori anonimi di *Hyperboreus*, a cui debbo la rimozione di imprudenze ed errori. Ringrazio anche Francesca Gazzano per le sue preziose osservazioni e il suo insostituibile sostegno.

¹ Testo di Kannicht 1969, qui e oltre.

² Sul valore di ἔστι δὲ δῆ in questo passo cf. Paley 1874, 127; su altri passi euripidei cf. Stevens 1976, 46.

³ Così intendo (cf. e.g. *Med.* 72–73 ὁ μέντοι μῦθος εἰ σαφῆς ὄδε / οὐκ οἶδα), anche se «vero» non è l’unica traduzione possibile: cf. e.g. Novo Taragna 1986, 133–134 e n. 34.

⁴ E.g. Jouan 1966, 9; Conacher 1967, 290–291; Podlecki 1970, 405; Lesky 1996, 621 e 634; Assaël 1987, 49; Fusillo 1997, 46 n. 9; Rodríguez Cidre 2014, 72; Wright 2017, *passim*; Moles 2018, 344–345 e n. 50 (con riferimenti). Caso-limite Eur. *HF* 1346, dove Eracle stesso parla sprezzantemente delle trovate dei poeti (cioè dei suoi stessi creatori): cf. Michelini 1987, 275–276.

su Zeus–(cigno)–Leda–uovo ai vv. 257–259,⁵ con un prudente φασίν, ma senza ironie nascoste. Il mito è accennato di nuovo nei passi lirici dei vv. 214–216 e 1145–1146, e in entrambi i casi l’atteggiamento del coro è quello di totale accettazione. Secondo Stinton la frase εἰ σαφῆς οὗτος λόγος esprimerebbe amarezza: «sono figlia di Zeus, ma ammetto che è difficile crederci; io stessa non mi capacito: un figlio di Zeus non dovrebbe soffrire come soffro io».⁶ Stinton indica, fra i casi analoghi, *Il. 3. 180* δαῖρ αὐτ’ ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος, εἴ ποτ’ ἔην γε. Con «se mai fu», Elena evidenzia l’abisso che si è scavato fra la vita onorata di un tempo e la vergogna del presente: chi crederebbe che questa miserabile adultera sia stata la cognata del re Agamennone?⁷

La carne di Elena è forte, ma il suo spirito è debole: ogni tanto la sua fede nella protezione degli dèi sembra vacillare. E anzi vacilla effettivamente: la profezia di Hermes (vv. 56–59), che sempre l’ha rassicurata in questi anni di esilio, ora non la rassicura più. E ciò può fornire una chiave di lettura per il problematico v. 873 Ἐλένη, τί τὰμά – πῶς ἔχει; – θεσπίσματα;⁸ Questa domanda a bruciapelo di Teonoe ad Elena ha fatto pensare a *iactatio* e *vanitas* da parte della giovane sacerdotessa.⁹ Io penso che si tratti piuttosto di un rimprovero: «sei venuta a consultare me perché hai dubitato delle parole di Hermes; ma le parole che provengono dagli dèi si compiono sempre: come vedi, le cose sono andate proprio come io ho detto».

Nei suoi *Euripidea tertia*, D. Kovacs espunge i vv. 20–21 dell’*Elena* in quanto conterrebbero elementi «irrelevant, clumsy, and nonsensical», incompatibili con il «cursory, glancing, and parenthetical account» che l’eroina sta fornendo qui.¹⁰ Christiaan Caspers ha poi finemente rilevato

⁵ La genuinità di questi versi è dubbia. Li accolgono Renehan 1969, 35–36 (con modifiche); Wolff 1973, 78 n. 42; Stinton 1976, 76 (con modifiche); Allan 2008; Melis 2016, 130–133; li respingono Kannicht 1969; Diggle 1994a; Kovacs 2003, 26; Caspers 2011, 66–67 n. 88. Anche il coro di Eur. *IA* 783 ss. è scettico sulla nascita di Elena da Zeus-cigno, ma si tratta di un’altra tragedia, e di altri parlanti: il parallelo non fa testo.

⁶ Stinton 1976, 74–79. Elena sa che Zeus ha dimostrato di tenere a lei (lei stessa dice οὐ γὰρ ἠμέλησέ μου / Ζεύς, vv. 45–46): ma ciò in nessun modo attenua il suo smarrimento di adesso. Non lontana da quella di Stinton è l’interpretazione di Kannicht 1969, II, 24–25. Una possibilità, un poco artificiosa a dire il vero, è che la perplessità di Elena non sia rivolta tanto al λόγος in sé, quanto ai suoi stravaganti dettagli.

⁷ Stinton 1976, 63, seguito da Morin 2003, 55 (forse senza saperlo: il nome di Stinton non compare nell’articolo della Morin) e da altri. Laird 1907, 303, interpreta la frase in tutt’altro modo.

⁸ Problematico e variamente interposto: ne parla esaurientemente Diggle 1994b, 428–429.

⁹ Così Dingelstad 1865, 42; Campbell 1950, 12–13; Post 1964, 105–106 (con discutibile proposta di modifica testuale).

¹⁰ Kovacs 2003, 26.

che di rado i *προλογίζοντες* teatrali dichiarano la propria identità con i verbi al passivo: la formula Ἑλένη δ' ἐκλήθην potrebbe perciò avere valenza metaletteraria: dicendo «fui chiamata Elena»,

she invites the spectators to recall that, in the course of the poetic tradition, the name «Helen» has come to stand for a lot of things, few of them pleasant. By saying that she was «called Helen», Euripides' heroine shoulders the burden of this tradition:¹¹ she is «what people think of as Helen», cause of the Trojan war, seducer of men and paradigm of the disloyal wife.¹²

Per parte mia, credo che l'accumulo di dettagli «irrilevanti, goffi e insensati» sui genitori di Elena non costituiscano una caduta artistica o un intervento di interpolatore, bensì un modo per suggerire una *Augenblicksetymologie*: Ἑλένη è colei che è nata da un ἐλεῖν εὐνήν, da un furto del letto.

Il nome Elena era un trastullo usuale dei poeti, a cominciare dalla celebre anafora ἐλένας εἰλανδρος ἐλέπτολις di Aesch. *Ag.* 688–689,¹³ rilanciata da Euripide nelle *Troiane* ai vv. 890 ss.,¹⁴ e divenuta nel tempo la madre di tutte le paretimologie;¹⁵ a tal punto che nella poesia successiva

¹¹ La «presa d'atto» di Elena del proprio passato letterario è ancora più sensibile, ovviamente, nel teatro latino: si veda Degl'Innocenti Pierini 2017, 80–81. Secondo la Pippin Burnett (1971, 92 e n. 10), questa coscienza di agire *nella* letteratura si riscontra talvolta anche in Menelao: un esempio sarebbe il v. 1056.

¹² Caspers 2011, 63. Naturalmente, come Caspers ben sa, l'uso dell'attivo non è una regola: cf. p. 63 n. 78 su Eur. *Phoen.* 10–13; *Hipp.* 2, ecc.; per una lettura diversa, ma ugualmente pregnante di Ἑλένη δ' ἐκλήθην, si veda De Sanctis 2019, 294.

¹³ Ἑλένας è correzione di Blomfield per il tràdito Ἑλένας, accolta dai più ma respinta da altri, fra cui recentemente Kovacs 2000, 71–72; Willink 2004, 479; Medda 2017, II, 396–397, che pensano a Ἑλένας da ἐλένη «torcia» (Kovacs, Willink) o a Ἑλένας = Ἑλένας (Medda), il che implicherebbe o la disgregazione del tricolon o l'assunzione dell'iperdorico e non tragico νᾶς = ναῦς. E così un'intenzione poetica che non potrebbe essere più chiara viene sacrificata alla difesa di una lezione su cui novantanove scribi su cento, forse cento su cento, sarebbero scivolati.

¹⁴ Non rendicontabile per la sua vastità la letteratura sul passo eschileo (e di riflesso sull'altro delle *Troiane*): Van Looy 1973, 359; Novo Taragna 1986, 134; Skutsch 1987, 192; Juffras 1993, 55; Kraus 1998, 144; Rinaldi 2007, 190–191; O'Hara 2017, 1 e 13. Sulle etimologie in Euripide il testo fondamentale è il già ricordato Van Looy 1973, integrato da Segal 1982, da Kraus 1998, da Rinaldi 2007.

¹⁵ Il passo dell'*Agamennone* sarà sfruttato da Ronsard nei suoi sonetti per Hélène de Surgère: cf. 2. 9. 1–4: «ny la douce pitié, ny le pleur lamentable / ne t'ont baillé ton nom: ton nom Grec vient d'oster, / de ravir, de tuer, de piller, d'emporter / mon esprit et mon coeur, ta proye miserable», con dotto accenno prima all' ἐλεῖν, poi all' ἐλεεῖν (e all' ἐλελιζειν?); nonché da Giovanni Pascoli (nell'*Anticiclo*, ma non solo), da Ezra Pound (*Cantos* 2. 10–11: «and the wave runs in the beach-groove: / 'Eleanor, ἐλένας and ἐλέπτολις!'), e da chissà quanti altri.

risulterà difficile non avvertire uno *scent of Helen* ogni volta che si incontrerà un ἔλ(εῖν) in relazione a vicende spartane o troiane.¹⁶ Chissà che persino gli ἑλώρια di *Il.* 1. 4 non provocassero un sussulto nel lettore antico. Per non parlare degli sviluppi moderni, soprattutto in quelle lingue in cui «Elena» assuona con «inferno». Faust si fa portare Elena, «the face that launched a thousand ships». Lo scienziato pazzo di *Metropolis* dà il nome di Hel all'automa malvagio che sostituisce la bella e buona Maria.¹⁷ Certo si fa presto in una materia come questa a travedere, a sovrainterpretare, a scivolare in eccessi alla *Beautiful mind*,¹⁸ ma l'automa del film di Fritz Lang è troppo simile all'εἶδωλον della storia stesicoreo-euripidea perché si possa pensare a una semplice coincidenza.¹⁹

Euripide torna a lavorare sul nome di Elena anche nel finale, allorché i Dioscuri preannunciano che l'isola che sta di fronte all'Attica, in cui Hermes ed Elena fecero sosta durante la rotta aerea per l'Egitto, prenderà nome «isola di Elena»:

¹⁶ Cf. e.g. *Hec.* 442–443 Ἐλένην ἴδοιμι· διὰ καλῶν γὰρ ὀμμάτων / αἴσχιστα Τροίαν εἶλε τὴν δυσδαίμονα; ma anche, forse, *Andr.* 105–106 εἶλε σ' ὁ χιλίωνας Ἑλλάδος ὠκὺς Ἄρης. In *Hel.* 199, dove Elena maledice il suo nome πολύπονον, si coglie forse ancora una eco dei tre ἔλε- eschilei. E in *Tr.* 766–771 οὐ γὰρ ποτ' ἀνχῶ Ζῆνά γ' ἐκφῦσαι σ' ἐγὼ / πολλοῖσι κῆρα βαρβάροις Ἑλλησί τε è evidente che il doppio intento di presentare Elena come nemica della vita (ζῆν) e creatura di distruzione (nessun ἔλεῖν espresso, ma senza dubbio presente alla complice memoria dell'autore e degli spettatori). I poeti, pur sfruttando altre associazioni di idee, si baloccavano anche con il vate Eleno: penso a Ἐλενος–ἐλεῖν–ἀλῶναι in *Soph. Phil.* 605 ss. e 1227 ss.; a Ἐλενος–ἔλεος in *Christod. Echphr.* 155; a Ἐλενος–νόος in *Quint. Sm.* 8. 254, o anche (ma qui con un grosso punto interrogativo) a *Ov. Met.* 13. 99 *Helenum* [...] *captum*, ecc. Ermia attesta una derivazione di Ἐλένη da ἑλενόη, i.e. ἡ ἐφελκομένη εἰς αὐτὴν τὸν νοῦν (*In Plat. Phaedr.* 77 Couvreur = 81. 30 Lucarini–Moreschini); Eliano (*NA* 9. 21) parla dell'erba *Helionion* che tiene alla larga i serpenti (cf. Rinaldi 2007, 192; Castrucci 2018, 30), probabilmente perché pensa, lui e/o la sua fonte, a un etimo ἔλεῖν ἰόν, «eliminare il veleno».

¹⁷ Una coppia Maria vs. Elena, dunque: del resto, come ricorda Norman Austin all'inizio della sua monografia *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom*, Elena è senza dubbio la donna più famosa della storia europea dopo la Vergine Maria (1994, 23).

¹⁸ Donde la frequenza – giusta frequenza – di *cautionary remarks* da parte degli studiosi più accorti e sensibili: Haslam 1992, 204; Cairns 1996, 52; Sluiter 2015, 922, ecc. Vedere o non vedere assonanze, etimologie, giochi di parole, dipende in maniera decisiva dalla volontà del lettore-uditore antico (cf. Gambarara 1984, 119); e quindi anche dalla volontà dello studioso moderno.

¹⁹ La differenza è che l'εἶδωλον dell'*Elena* svolge malvolentieri il suo compito distruttivo, come Lissa nell'*Eracle*. L'εἶδωλον «si dissol[ve] nell'aria con parole di scherno», dice Mureddu 2005, 217, ma erroneamente: non c'è nessuno scherno nei vv. 608–615 (cf. e.g. Webster 1967, 200; Pippin Burnett 1971, 84).

οἷ δ' ὄρισέν σοι πρῶτα Μαιάδος τόκος, 1670
 Σπάρτης ἀπάρας τὸν κατ' οὐρανὸν δ<ρ>όμον,
 κλέψας δέμας σὸν μὴ Πάρις γήμειέ σε –
 φρουρὸν παρ' Ἀκτὴν τεταμένην νῆσον λέγω –
 Ἑλένη τὸ λοιπὸν ἐν βροτοῖς κεκλήσεται,
 ἐπεὶ κλοπαίαν σ' ἐκ δόμων ἐδέξατο. 1675

L'autenticità di questi versi e le lezioni tramandate da L sono da sempre oggetto di discussione. Al posto di οἷ, ὄρισεν e σοι sono stati proposti οἷ, ὄρμισεν e σε (che è anche lezione di P). Personalmente non vedo ragioni per correggere. Andrà invece accolto τὸν κατ' οὐρανὸν δρόμον di Wilamowitz per τῶν (τὸν) κατ' οὐρανὸν δόμων al v. 1671. I vv. 1670–1675 pongono un problema geografico: passare nei pressi di Macronisi (questo è il nome moderno della νῆσος τεταμένη del v. 1673) è normale per chi si sposti da Sparta a Troia o da Troia a Sparta seguendo la costa. È invece una fermata inattesa per chi da Sparta punti verso sud – specie volando, come fanno Elena ed Hermes. Ma se, come si ipotizza in un passo di Stefano di Bisanzio (381. 6–10), Paride ed Elena puntarono dritti sulla Fenicia, ecco che Macronisi diventa un ricovero sicuro per la (vera) Elena: all'adultero non sarebbe mai venuto in mente di passare di lì. Euripide fa agire Hermes come uno scout o un agente segreto, ma non c'era altro modo per inserire nella storia della καὶνὴ Ἑλένη un *dominion* di Atene – di Atene-paladina, rifugio di perseguitati, di deboli, di fuggiaschi. Tutto questo è forse un ragionare ἔξω τοῦ δράματος, e quindi sul nulla, ma non si può dubitare che anche il pubblico di Euripide si interrogasse su questo poco lineare *iter Helenae*.

A rigore, l'etimologia del v. 1675 non serve: il lustro stesso del personaggio visitante basta a rendere ragione del nuovo toponimo.²⁰ Ma Euripide sapeva che un'isola – una qualche isola – aveva un ruolo anche nel mito standard di Elena adultera. Paride nell'*Iliade* rivela di aver consumato il suo primo amplesso con Elena «su un'isola rocciosa» – oppure «sull'isola di Cranae», se, come in genere si fa, si stampa Κρανᾶη παροσσίτονο e con la maiuscola: *Il.* 3. 344–345 ὅτε σε πρῶτον Λακεδαίμονος ἐξ ἐρατεινῆς / ἔπλεον ἀρπάξας (...). νῆσῳ δ' ἐν Κρανᾶη ἐμίγην φιλότῃ καὶ εὐνῇ. Gli eruditi collegavano κραναή-Κρανᾶη con κραίνειν, «portare a termine (l'atto amoroso)».²¹ L'identificazione di Cranae non è unanime: alcuni

²⁰ È ciò che accade nel caso di Oreste (la città di Orestio così chiamata per un occasionale passaggio dell'eroe) e in molti altri casi: cf. Dunn 1996, 54–55; 93.

²¹ Sch. *Il.* 3. 445 a (Ariston.). ἀπὸ τοῦ κρανηῖναι ἐπ' αὐτῆς πρῶτον τὸν γάμον καὶ τελειωθῆναι τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῆς Ἑλένης. L'amplesso è μῖξις e non κρᾶσις, ma, data la prossimità concettuale, anche un ammiccamento a κραννύναι sarebbe più che plausibile.

pensavano all'isola di Macronisi (Strab. 9. 1. 22; si veda sopra), altri a un'isola al largo del Peloponneso (Paus. 3. 22. 1), nei pressi di Gizio.²² Un'isola compare anche nella storia del *ritorno* di Elena da Troia (Hecat. *FGrHist* 1 F 128 μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν Ἰλίου; cf. Paus. 1. 35. 1); e di nuovo non ci si è accontentati di spiegare il nome «isola Elena» come dovuto al solo fatto che Elena vi sbarcò. Uno scolio iliadico dice che per via di una tempesta molti soldati morirono in quei pressi: sch. *Il.* 3. 445 b (I 437 Erbse) οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ νῦν Ἑλένη· τῷ χειμῶνι γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἀπολώλασιν αὐτόθι: evidentemente l'autore di questa nota trasferisce all'isola i poteri distruttivi della donna ἑλένας ed ἔλανδρος. Euripide sentì di dover sfidare la *standard story* anche su questo terreno e propose l'accostamento Ἑλένη-κλοπή.²³

Come ha notato John Wilson, le etimologie tragiche dei prologhi e quelle degli esodi rispondono a logiche diverse.²⁴ Così è probabilmente anche nell'*Elena*.²⁵ S'intende che non è una difficoltà neppure minima il fatto che Ἑλένη venga etimologizzato in due modi diversi in una stessa *pièce*.²⁶ L'etimologia che propongo per il v. 22 sarebbe del tipo-Astianatte o del tipo-Odisseo, cioè retrospettiva, nel senso che mirerebbe a fissare

²² Jacqueline Duchemin, partendo dall'evidenza che l'isola di Macronisi è fuori mano per tutte le rotte di Elena, massime per quella diretta a sud, postulava l'esistenza di una terza località: un'«isola Elena» al largo dell'Egitto (Duchemin 1940, 169). In effetti la zona era ricca di toponimi connessi con il νόστος di Menelao (cf. e.g. Brillante 2002, 138; Debiasi 2008, 135). Ma la Duchemin si basa su un testo greco che non sta in piedi. Wilson 1968, 70, colloca l'«isola di Elena» del Chersoneso tracio, confondendo i vv. 1670 ss. dell'*Elena* con i vv. 1270 ss. dell'*Ecuba* (e magari leggendo male un suo appunto: *Hel.* > *Hec.*).

²³ Licofrone contaminò le due tradizioni: cf. Gigante Lanzara 2010, 262 su Lycophr. *Alex.* 110 ss.

²⁴ Wilson 1968, 67. Ancora diverse (più rare, ma più ironiche) le etimologie che i poeti usano nelle parti centrali dei drammi.

²⁵ Kannicht 1969, II, 21, osserva che le etimologie in Euripide si fanno più frequenti dalle *Troiane* in poi. Su prologhi ed esodi come luoghi privilegiati di etimologie e giochi di parole cf. e.g. Wilson 1968, 67–68 (si veda subito sopra); Biga 2015, 58; Allan 2008, 344.

²⁶ Le etimologie antiche sono spesso plurime: quattro o cinque quelle di Apollo nel *Cratilo*; sei quelle di Posidone in *Et. M.* s.v. Ποσειδῶν (684 ss. Gaisford), ecc.; cf. e.g. Delcourt 1953, 136; Lallot 1988, 138, 140 e *passim*; Cairns 1996, 34–35; Cairns 2002, 476. Uno scolio a Dion. Thrax *GG* 1. 3. 470 Hilgard teorizza apertamente che δεῖ δὲ ἐτυμολογεῖν ὡς ἂν ἕκαστος κατὰ ἰδίαν ἐπιβουλὴν κινούμενος ἄπτηται τοῦ κατὰ τὴν λέξιν σημανομένου (cf. Peraki-Kyriakidou 2002, 487). Quanto al nostro caso, le esegesi di Elena nell'*Elena* diventerebbero addirittura tre se fra esse includessimo anche Ἑλένη-Ἑλληνίς dei vv. 561–563 (cf. Blondell 2013, 218–219); che però non è tanto un'etimologia quanto un gioco di parole, che è altra cosa (e.g. Quincey 1963, 142).

un evento o una condizione precedente alla nascita del *nominandus*.²⁷ Sarebbe inoltre un'etimologia del tipo ἑλένας, con valorizzazione di entrambi i (presunti) elementi del (presunto) composto.²⁸ La seconda invece sarebbe, anzi è, un passaggio da antroponimo a toponimo, con l'aggiunta di un elemento di diatriba mitico-letteraria.²⁹ In entrambi i casi l'autore adotta la tecnica della soppressione del termine medio:³⁰ al v. 20 ἴ' ἐλεῖν va «estratto» da δόλιος + ἐκπράξασθαι, ai vv. 1674–1675 da κλοπαίαν + δέξασθαι.³¹ La ψυχρότης delle etimologie greche, per non parlare delle *Klangfiguren*,³² è una caratteristica che si accentua col passare dei secoli ma che è già presentissima in età classica, come possono dimostrare i frammenti di Eraclito, il *Cratilo* di Platone o il *Papiro di Derveni*.³³ Tornando ai vv. 20–22, l'analisi di Stinton a mio parere convince e funziona, specie se si suppone che εἰ σαφῆς κτλ. venga

²⁷ Cf. *Od.* 19. 406–407, un passo archetipico nel suo genere, con una 'scena di denominazione' particolarmente articolata e motivata (si veda Gambarara 1984, 122 ss.). L'imposizione del nome ἐκ τῶν πρόσθεν capiterebbe anche per un altro personaggio del prologo dell'*Elena*, Teoclimeno, che secondo si legge ai vv. 9 b – 10 a sarebbe stato chiamato così ἴσθι δὴ ἴθι θεοῦς σέβων / βίον διήνεγκ'. Questi versi sono stati espunti da Nauck e dalla stragrande maggioranza degli editori in quanto presentano un errore metrico e contengono un'etimologia (di Teoclimeno) che è stata ritenuta inadeguata (cf. Jordan 2006, 10 e 23 n. 5; Burian 2007, 191, ecc.). Due motivazioni deboli (cf. Wright 2005, 195 n. 29; Inglese 2008, 57–58).

²⁸ Per alcuni casi analoghi in Euripide, si veda, di nuovo, Van Looy 1973 (e.g. Διώνσος, διθύραμβος, ἐνιαυτός, ecc.), soprattutto pp. 341 ss.; nonché Kraus 1998, 150–151 (Ἡρακλῆς).

²⁹ Zuntz 1960, 203, pensa a un fatto di *Lokalphilismus*, a un abile grazioso innesto «on to our dear national myth» di una favola per il resto ambientata fra Sparta e l'Oriente. Ma in genere il giudizio è più severo: gli studiosi parlano volentieri di etimologia «perfunctory and detached», inserita a forza: cf. Dunn 1996, 136–137; Burian 2007, 292, ecc.

³⁰ Traggo il termine «soppressione» da O'Hara 2017, 79 ss., che a sua volta lo trae da Servio.

³¹ Dale 1967, 168, considera il nesso ἐλεῖν–κλέπτειν «more than usually far-fetched», ma non vedo perché: il caso non è diverso da e.g. *Alc.* 712–713, dove alla battuta di Ferete τύχη μὴ ζῆν, οὐ δυοῖν, ὀφείλομεν, Admeto risponde καὶ μὴν Διός γε μείζονα ζῶης χρόνον, dove è il lettore-spettatore che deve arrivare a ζῆν attraverso l'equivalenza Διός–Ζηνός, oppure dal fr. 182 Kannicht dall'*Antiopé* (fr. 3 Van Looy) con omissione di ἰέναι (Aristofane nota l'inconsequenza e se ne fa beffe: cf. fr. 342 KA), ecc.

³² Intendo casi come Eur. *Alc.* 160 ἐλούσατ', ἐκ δ' ἐλοῦσα; *Tr.* 14 Δούρειος ἵππος, κρυπτὸν ἀμπίσχων δόρυ, ecc.: cf. Van Looy 1973, 352 (Paride da Πήρα, Danae da δηναϊός), 362 (γυνή da γονή) e *passim*.

³³ La notorietà e l'importanza di questi autori e testi non hanno bisogno di essere sottolineate. Mi limito a pochi rimandi: Gianvittorio 2010; Anceschi 2007; Kotwick 2017. Sguardo generale in Gambarara 1984, 168 ss.; 224 ss.

completato con una successiva, fulminea *correctio*: dicono che Zeus rubò un amplesso a Leda sotto forma di cigno. Si può dubitare di questo λόγος, specie vedendo in che situazione mi trovo adesso. Si può dubitare sì: ma fatto sta (δέ avversativo) che fui chiamata *Ελέ(ευ)νη, «amplesso rubato». L'ipotesi del gioco etimologico non è una di quelle che si impongono *ictu oculi*, ma certo è plausibile: la concatenazione dei pensieri si fa più chiara, non solo più «ingegnosa».

L'εὐνή estorta contro la propria volontà è un destino che Elena, lasciata in balia di Teoclimeno, è ormai certa di dover condividere con la madre. Ma Elena è un «amplesso rubato» anche nel senso che è stata sottratta a Paride, come poi sarà sottratta allo stesso Teoclimeno. Facendo leva sul κλέπτειν, la «politica del Monte Olimpo»³⁴ ha escogitato uno strabiliante contrappasso. Ed è infatti sul κλέπτειν che i Dioscuri insistono nel loro *ex machina speech*: Hermes ha «rubato» (κλέψας) il corpo di Elena e ha depositato l'oggetto di tale furto (κλοπαίαν) su un'isola deserta³⁵ – in attesa, evidentemente, di raggiungere la destinazione definitiva.

Walter Lapini
 Università di Genova (C)
 walter.lapini@unige.it

Bibliografia

- W. Allan (ed.), *Euripides. Helen* (Cambridge 2008).
 B. Anceschi, *Die Götternamen in Platons Kratylos* (Frankfurt am Main 2007).
 J. Assaël, “Les transformations du mythe dans l’*Hélène* d’Euripide”, *Pallas* 33 (1987) 41–54.
 N. Austin, *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom* (Ithaca–London 1994).
 A. M. Biga (ed.), *L’Antiope di Euripide* (Trento 2015).
 R. Blondell, *Helen of Troy: Beauty, Myth, Devastation* (Oxford 2013).
 C. Brillante, M. Bettini, *Il mito di Elena. Immagini e racconti dalla Grecia a oggi* (Torino 2002).
 P. Burian (ed.), *Euripides. Helen* (Liverpool 2007).
 F. Cairns, “Ancient ‘Etymology’ and Tibullus: On the Classification of ‘Etymologies’ on ‘Etymological Markers’”, *PCPhS* 42 (1996) 24–59.
 F. Cairns, “Acontius and his *ounoma kouridion*: Callimachus *Aetia* fr. 67. 1–4 Pf.”, *CQ* 52 (2002) 471–477.

³⁴ Prendo la suggestiva espressione da Blondell 2013, 205.

³⁵ Austin 1994, 185–186, mette le cose in modo un po’ romanzesco: traduce l’isola Elena «The Stolen»: ultima traccia, ultimo ricordo della lunga prigionia dell’eroina.

- A. Y. Campbell (ed.), *Euripides' Helena* (Liverpool 1950).
- C. L. Caspers, *Healing Speech, Wandering Names, Contests of Words. Ideas about Language in Euripides*. Diss. (Leiden 2011).
- G. Castrucci, "Il romanzo di Elena in Achille Tazio: reminiscenze tragiche", *Parole Rubate* 17 (2018) 21–42.
- D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme and Structure* (Toronto 1967).
- A. M. Dale (ed.), *Euripides. Helen* (Oxford 1967).
- A. Debiasi, *Esiodo e l'occidente* (Roma 2008).
- R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, "Hymen funestus: i paradossi di Elena nelle *Troades senecane*", in: F. Citti, A. Iannucci, A. Ziosi (edd.), *Troiane classiche e contemporanee* (Hildesheim 2017) 73–106.
- M. Delcourt, "La légende de Kaineus", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 144 (1953) 129–150.
- D. De Sanctis, "Il *kleos* e l'*onoma* di Elena nell'*Elena* di Euripide", *Daidalos* 17 (2019) 291–301.
- J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae* III (Oxonii 1994a).
- J. Diggle, *Euripidea. Collected essays* (Oxford 1994b).
- H. Dingelstad, *De Euripidis Helena commentatio philologica* (Monasterii 1865).
- J. Duchemin, "L'île d'Hélène dans la tragédie d'Euripide", *REG* 53 (1940) 163–171.
- F. M. Dunn, *Tragedy's End: Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama* (New York – Oxford 1996).
- M. Fusillo (ed.), *Euripide. Elena* (Milano 1997).
- D. Gambarara, *Alle fonti della filosofia del linguaggio: lingua e nomi nella cultura greca arcaica* (Roma 1984).
- L. Gianvittorio, *Il discorso di Eraclito* (Zürich – New York 2010).
- V. Gigante Lanzara, "Echi dell'*Elena* euripidea nell'*Alessandra*", *PP* 65 (2010) 257–264.
- M. Haslam, "Hidden Signs: Aratus *Diosemeiai* 45 ff., Vergil *Georgics* 1. 424 ff.", *HSCP* 94 (1992) 199–204.
- L. Inglese, "Note critiche al prologo dell'*Elena* euripidea", *AION (filol)* 30 (2008) 55–63.
- D. R. Jordan, "Patterns and Laughter in Euripides' *Helen*", *SO* 81 (2006) 6–28.
- F. Jouan, *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens*. Diss. (Paris 1966).
- D. M. Juffras, "Helen and Other Victims in Euripides' *Helen*", *Hermes* 121 (1993) 45–57.
- R. Kannicht (ed.), *Euripides. Helena* (Heidelberg 1969).
- M. E. Kotwick (ed.), *Der Papyrus von Derveni* (Berlin–Boston 2017).
- D. Kovacs, "Why is Helen Fitly Named? (Aesch. *Ag.* 681–692)", *Eikasmos* 11 (2000) 71–72.
- D. Kovacs, *Euripidea tertia* (Leiden–Boston 2003).
- C. S. Kraus, "Dangerous Supplements: Etymology and Genealogy in Euripides' *Heracles*", *PCPhS* 44 (1998) 137–157.
- A. G. Laird, "Εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε", *CJ* 2 (1907) 303–305.

- J. Lallot, “Etymologia: l’étymologie en Grèce ancienne d’Homère aux grammairiens alexandrins”, in: J.-P. Chambon, G. Lüdi (edd.), *Discours étymologiques*, Actes du colloque international, Bâle–Freiburg–Mulhouse 16–18 mai 1988 (Tübingen 1991) 135–147.
- A. Lesky, *La poesia tragica dei Greci*. Trad. it. (Bologna 1996).
- E. Medda (ed.), *Eschilo. Agamennone* (Roma 2017).
- V. Melis, “Eur. *Hel.* 255–305 e l’*Encomio di Elena* di Gorgia: un dialogo intertestuale”, *Lexis* 34 (2016) 130–144.
- A. N. Micheleni, *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition* (Madison 1987).
- F. Moles, “Il lato oscuro della bellezza: Elena come immagine della paura in Euripide”, in: M. De Poli (ed.), *Il teatro delle emozioni: la paura*, Atti del Primo Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Padova 24–25 maggio 2018 (Padova 2018) 335–355.
- B. Morin, “Hélène a-t-elle vraiment changé?”, *BAGB* s.n. (2003) 50–76.
- P. Mureddu, “Il riconoscimento di Elena come percorso di episteme: Euripide e le teorie sofistiche sulla conoscenza”, *Prometheus* 31 (2005) 216–224.
- S. Novo Taragna, “Forma linguistica del contrasto realtà-apparenza nell’*Elena* di Euripide”, in: E. Corsini (ed.), *La polis e il suo teatro* (Padova 1986) 127–147.
- J. O’Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor 2017).
- F. A. Paley (ed.), *Euripides II* (London 1874).
- H. Peraki-Kyriakidou, “Aspects of Ancient Etymologizing”, *CQ* 52 (2002) 478–493.
- A. Pippin Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides’ Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford 1971).
- A. J. Podlecki, “The Basic Seriousness of Euripides’ *Helen*”, *TAPA* 101 (1970) 401–418.
- L. A. Post, “Menander and the *Helen* of Euripides”, *HSCPh* 68 (1964) 99–118.
- J. H. Quincey, “Etymologica”, *RhM* 106 (1963) 142–148.
- R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, MA 1969).
- D. Rinaldi, “Juegos etimológicos in Eurípides”, *Nova Tellus* 25 (2007) 155–216.
- E. Rodríguez Cidre, “Duplicidades peligrosas: realidad y apariencia en la rhesis de Helena de Eurípides”, *QUCC* 107 (2014) 67–79.
- C. Segal, “Etymologies and Double Meaning in Euripides’ *Bacchae*”, *Glotta* 60 (1982) 81–93.
- O. Skutsch, “Helen: Her Name and Nature”, *JSH* 107 (1987) 188–193.
- I. Sluiter, “Ancient Etymology: a Tool for Thinking”, in: F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, A. Rengakos (edd.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship II* (Leiden–Boston 2015) 896–922.
- P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides* (Wiesbaden 1976).
- T. C. W. Stinton, ““Si credere dignum est”: some expressions of disbelief in Euripides and others”, *PCPhS* 20 (1976) 60–89 (= id., *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* [Oxford 1990] 236–264).
- M. Sulzberger, “*Onoma eponymon*: les noms propres chez Homère et dans la mythologie grecque”, *REG* 39 (1926) 381–447.

- H. Van Looy, “Παρετυμολογεῖ ὁ Εὐριπίδης”, in: *Zetesis: album amicorum*, door vrienden en collega’s aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. E. de Strycker (Antwerpen–Utrecht 1973) 345–366.
- T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London 1967).
- C. W. Willink, “Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 681–716”, *Mnemosyne* 57 (2004) 478–481.
- J. R. Wilson, “Etymology in Euripides, *Troades*, 13–14”, *AJPh* 89 (1968) 66–71.
- C. Wolff, “On Euripides’ *Helen*”, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 61–84.
- M. Wright, *Euripides’ Escape-tragedies. A Study of Helen, Andromeda and Iphigenia among the Taurians* (Oxford 2005).
- M. Wright, “Myth”, in: L. McClure (ed.), *A Companion to Euripides* (Chichester 2017) 468–482.
- G. Zuntz, “On Euripides’ *Helena*: Theology and Irony”, in: *Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique* VI: *Euripide*, sept exposés et discussions par J. C. Kamerbeek, André Rivier, Hans Diller, Albin Lesky, R. P. Winnington Ingram, Günther Zuntz, Victor Martin (Vandoeuvres–Genève 1960) 199–241.

The hypothesis is advanced that in *Hel.* 19–20 Λήδαν κύκνου μορφώματ’ ὄρνιθος λαβών, / ὃς δόλιον εὐνήν ἐξέπραξ’ ὑπ’ αἰετοῦ Euripides suggests the etymology Ἑλένη from ἐλεῖν εὐνήν, “she who was born from a stolen intercourse” (Zeus’ one with Leda).

Выдвигается гипотеза, что в *Hel.* 19–20 Λήδαν κύκνου μορφώματ’ ὄρνιθος λαβών, / ὃς δόλιον εὐνήν ἐξέπραξ’ ὑπ’ αἰετοῦ Еврипид предлагает этимологию имени Ἑλένη от ἐλεῖν εὐνήν: “та, что родилась от украденного объятия” (Зевса и Леды).

Valeria Petrova

THE BRONZE HORSE AND THE LIFETIME
OF SIMON THE ATHENIAN*

Simon the Athenian was famous for a work about horses, of which a passage entitled *περὶ εἶδους καὶ ἐπιλογῆς ἵππων* and several minor fragments survived.¹ His book appears to be one of the earliest specimens of Greeks' technical treatises and Attic prose; it was highly estimated by Xenophon and remained as an important reference work ever since.² Therefore, establishing Simon's lifetime is of particular interest.

The *terminus post quem* is provided by the evidence (Poll. 2. 69; Hierocl. *Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum* B 59. 6)³ that Simon criticized Micon, the famous painter of the Early Classical period,⁴ for depicting eyelashes on a horse's lower eyelid, although in fact they did not exist at all.⁵

The *terminus ante quem* has been indicated⁶ on the base of Xenophon's work *On Horsemanship* (Xen. *De re equ.* 1. 1):

Συνέγραψε μὲν οὖν καὶ Σίμων περὶ ἵππικῆς ὅς καὶ τὸν κατὰ τὸ Ἐλευσίνιον Ἀθήνησιν ἵππον χαλκοῦν ἀνέθηκε καὶ ἐν τῷ βάρῳ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ

* I thank Associate Professor N. A. Almazova for help and the valuable advices; Professor A. L. Verlinsky for providing me with the relevant literature for this research and making critical notes; and Marco Nicolich and Theodoros Kameris for language assistance.

¹ See the editions: Daremberg 1853, 169–170; Blass 1864, 49–59; Dindorf 1866, xx–xxiii; Oder 1896a, 52–69; id. 1896b, 311–313; Soukup 1911 (ed., tr., comm.); Rühl 1912, 196–197; Oder–Hoppe 1927, 228–231; Pierleoni 1937, 299–304; Delebecque 1950, 160–163 (ed., tr., comm.); Widdra 1964, 41–44; Sestili 2006 (ed., tr., comm.).

² Oder 1896a, 56–57; id. 1896c, 14–20; McCabe 2007, 194–197.

³ Blass 1864, 51.

⁴ For the period of Micon's activity see Lippold 1932, 1557–1558. *OCD* s.v. dates it back to the 1st half of the fifth century BC, *DNP* s.v. to 475–440 BC.

⁵ A claim that Simon would have criticized his contemporary rather than a master of an earlier period (Lenormant 1856, 52) does not seem convincing: Micon painted the walls of public buildings, so his works could be seen by several generations of Athenian citizens.

⁶ Blass 1864, 50–51.

ἔργα ἐξετύπωσεν· ἡμεῖς γε μέντοι ὅσοις συνετύχομεν ταῦτὰ γρόντες ἐκεῖνῳ, οὐκ ἐξαλείφομεν ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων, ἀλλὰ πολὺ ἥδιον παραδώσομεν αὐτὰ τοῖς φίλοις, νομίζοντες ἀξιοπιστότερα εἶναι ὅτι κάκεῖνος κατὰ ταῦτὰ ἡμῖν ἔγνω ἰππικὸς ὢν· καὶ ὅσα δὴ παρέλιπεν ἡμεῖς πειρασόμεθα δηλῶσαι.

Simon too has written on horsemanship, the same man who dedicated the bronze horse near the Eleusinion in Athens and had his deeds carved on its base. Nevertheless, I will not remove from my work those parts where our ideas coincide but, on the contrary, I will be happy to transmit them to my friends, considering them still more trustworthy since they are shared by a person so experienced in horsemanship. Those points, which he has not elucidated, I am going to explain.

Most scholars tend to date Xenophon's treatise back to 366–362 BC. It is known that another work of him, *Hipparchicus*, was written earlier than *On Horsemanship*. We can deduce that from Xenophon's reference to the former work at the end of the latter (*De re equ.* 12. 14). In *Hipparchicus*, Xenophon mentions an alliance with Sparta (*Hipp.* 9. 4) and refers to the Boeotians as the enemies of the Athenians (7. 3). Those were peculiar political circumstances which occurred in a rather short period before the Battle of Mantinea (362 BC).⁷ It follows that the creation of Simon's treatise preceded 360ies.

An opinion worth taking into consideration is the one of É. Delebecque. He claims that the last chapter of *On Horsemanship* which contains the reference to the *Hipparchicus* is a later addition to the main text that was probably drafted in 357/6 BC.⁸ Chapters 1–11 are related by him to the period of Xenophon's sojourn in Scillus (387–379/8 BC). Dating of *On Horsemanship* cannot be compelling, since it does not contain any explicit chronological marks. Delebecque's conclusions rest upon analyzing the general mood of the treatise and its educational scope which suits well the period of bringing up Xenophon's sons.⁹ Accepting this hypothesis, *terminus ante quem* for Simon's work can be moved from 360ies to 380ies.

Meanwhile, it seems that the timeframe of Simon's activity can be made still narrower by more detailed analysis of Xenophon's evidence. The way Xenophon refers to the statue of the horse makes clear that he had seen the monument with his own eyes and that he considered it to

⁷ Christ–Schmid 1912, 515.

⁸ Delebecque 1957, 243; 245; 425; 431–432.

⁹ Delebecque 1957, 242–245.

be well-known to anyone familiar with the topography of Athens. This is understandable, given that the bronze horse occupied a conspicuous position near the Eleusinion temple above the Athenian Agora on the north slope of the Acropolis,¹⁰ where processions including horsemen passed (Xen. *Hipp.* 3. 3). Thus, Xenophon mentions the famous statue to identify the person he is speaking about.

A question appears: what was the last opportunity left to Xenophon to see Simon's dedication? As we know, Xenophon left Athens in 401 BC and took part in the expedition of Cyrus the Young (Xen. *Anab.* 3. 1. 4–11; Diog. L. 2. 55). He later spent a long time in exile (Xen. *Anab.* 7. 7. 57; 5. 3. 7; Diog. L. 2. 51; Paus. 5. 6. 5). Therefore, if it is possible to prove that since 401 BC Xenophon had not visited Athens (by the time he made a reference to Simon's work in *De re equ.* 1. 1), it would follow that Simon's horse was already erected by 401 BC. Extant evidence shows that this is the most probable situation.

Let us first overview the information at our disposal as to when the exile of Xenophon actually began.¹¹ The last possible date is 394 BC when he took part in the Battle of Coronea on the Spartan side (Xen. *Anab.* 5. 3. 6; *Agesil.* 2. 9; *Hell.* 4. 3. 16; cf. Plut. *Ages.* 18. 2; Diog. L. 2. 51) against his native polis.¹²

However, Diogenes Laertius (2. 51) relates that Xenophon was convicted for his attachment to the Lacedaemonians as he joined the Spartan King Agesilaus, after meeting with him in Asia (396 BC or later):¹³

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τ' ἀνάβασιν καὶ τὰς ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ συμφορὰς καὶ τὰς παρασπονδήσεις τὰς Σεύθου τοῦ τῶν Ὀδρουσῶν βασιλέως ἤκεν εἰς Ἀσίαν πρὸς Ἀγησίλαον τὸν Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλέα, μισθοῦ τοὺς Κύρου στρατιώτας αὐτῷ παρασχών· φίλος τ' ἦν εἰς ὑπερβολήν. παρ' ὄν καιρὸν ἐπὶ Λακωνισμῷ φυγὴν ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων κατεγνώσθη.

It is noticeable that this evidence is inaccurate:¹⁴ in fact, Xenophon brought the former mercenaries of Cyrus to another Spartan general Thimbron in

¹⁰ Philostr. *Vita sophist.* 2, p. 550 Olearius; see Lenormant 1856, 45–48.

¹¹ See the overview of opinions on the date and cause of Xenophon's exile in Tuplin 1987, 60.

¹² This is the position e.g. of Niebuhr 1827, 467; Grote 1861, 175 with n. 2; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1881, 333; Roquette 1884, 20; Breitenbach 1967, 1575; Lendle 1995, 315.

¹³ This leads some scholars, e.g. Letronne [1825] 14 and Croiset 1873, 262, to think that the banishment took place in 394 BC, but before the Battle of Coronea.

¹⁴ Mure 1857, 238; Croiset 1873, 259; Klett 1900, 20.

399 BC (s. Xen. *Anab.* 7. 8. 24; cf. *Hell.* 3. 1. 6). Service rendered to him could hardly cause a charge on behalf of the Athenians, since they were themselves allies of Sparta at those times and sent a cavalry to Thimbron's army (Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1. 4).¹⁵

The Cyreians next served under Dercylides' command (*Hell.* 3. 1. 8) and then came over to Agesilaus. It is not known what Xenophon was doing in the intermediate period. Some scholars¹⁶ admit that he came back to Athens for a while but was soon disappointed with the situation in his native city and returned to Asia to join Dercylides in a war against Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus. W. Mure¹⁷ argues that he remained absent from Athens at that time, although perhaps visited other parts of continental Greece, such as Delphi (where he made an offering, s. *Anab.* 5. 3. 5). Others¹⁸ suggest that Xenophon did not leave Asia before coming to Boeotia with Agesilaus.

According to Pausanias (5. 6. 5) the reason for the exile was Xenophon's participation in the expedition headed by Cyrus, an enemy of Athens (during the Peloponnesian war he sponsored the Spartan navy and thus deprived the Athenians of their superiority at sea), against the Persian king who was friendly to the interests of the Athenians at that time.

ἐδιώχθη δὲ ὁ Ξενοφῶν ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ὡς ἐπὶ βασιλέα τῶν Περσῶν σφίσειν εὐνοῦν ὄντα στρατείας μετασχὼν Κύρῳ πολεμιοτάτῳ τοῦ δήμου.

The same reason is adduced by Diogenes in his epigram cited in 2. 58 (= *Anth. Pal.* 7. 98. 1–2: ... σέ, Ξενοφῶν, Κραναοῦ Κέκροπός τε πολῖται / φεύγειν κατέγων τοῦ φίλου χάριν Κύρου: thus, the biographer contradicts himself as to what exactly Xenophon's crime consisted in). The last version is sponsored by Xenophon himself, who relates Socrates' concern that joining Cyrus' army could cause irritation of the Athenians (*Anab.* 3. 1. 5). Pausanias does not provide a precise date of Xenophon's condemnation, but if it was caused by his engagement with Cyrus, then it was likely to have followed soon after his adventures became publicly known,¹⁹ i.e. after the arrival of the Greeks to Byzantium (spring 400 BC²⁰). However, at this time Artaxerxes was hardly "disposing

¹⁵ Mure 1857, 239.

¹⁶ E.g. Grote 1861, 174; Croiset 1873, 262.

¹⁷ Mure 1857, 244–246.

¹⁸ E.g. Klett 1900, 20; Canfora 1983, 68.

¹⁹ Mure 1857, 238.

²⁰ On the date see Lee 2008, 40.

goodwill” towards the Athenians since in 399 they sent the cavalry against the king (Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1. 4).²¹

Thus, later sources provide contradictory and doubtful evidence. Apparently, the authors of the Roman times did not possess reliable information. Therefore, the only person we can trust concerning Xenophon’s life is Xenophon himself. *Anab.* 7. 7. 57 has been used to argue that his exile started in 399 BC:²²

Ξενοφῶν δὲ οὐ προσήει, ἀλλὰ φανερός ἦν οἴκαδε παρασκευαζόμενος·
οὐ γάρ πω ψήφος αὐτῷ ἐπῆκτο Ἀθήνησι περὶ φυγῆς.

The passage clearly shows that in March/April 399 Xenophon still felt free to return home. By adding this remark, he anticipates the possible question of his readers who were aware of his condemnation just about the time in question and would possibly wonder how he could plan a journey to Athens. Xenophon explains that at *that* moment he was not yet banished. This may imply that he was sentenced shortly after he made over his army to Thimbron. In this case we can be sure that Xenophon did not have time for even a short visit to Athens in the period between the return of Cyrus’ Greek mercenaries and the Battle of Coronea. However, one must admit that, regarded from the later period when Xenophon was writing the *Anabasis* and his readers knew him as “the Athenian exile” but were not necessarily informed of the details, the words οὐ ... πω could just as well imply a later date of banishment, covering as much as several years.²³

Another Xenophon’s reference to his exile is *Anab.* 5. 3. 6–7. He relates that in spring or summer 394, before leaving Asia for Greece, he left a certain sum of money to Megabyzus, a priest of Ephesian Artemis, with an instruction to return the money if he survived and to dedicate it to the goddess in case of his death. Next, the text runs as follows:²⁴

ἐπειδὴ δ’ ἔφευγεν (ἐπεὶ δ’ ἔφευγεν A, ἐπεὶ δ’ ἔφυγε FM) ὁ Ξενοφῶν,
κατοικοῦντος ἤδη αὐτοῦ ἐν Σκιλλοῦντι ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων
οἰκισθέντος παρὰ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν ἀφικνεῖται Μεγάβυζος εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν
θεωρήσων καὶ ἀποδίδοσι τὴν παρακαταθήκην αὐτῷ.

²¹ Croiset 1873, 119.

²² Mure 1857, 241–242; Nicolai 1864, 814–815; Klett 1900, 25; Delebecque 1957, 120.

²³ Krüger 1822, 250; Breitenbach 1967, 1575; Rahn 1981, 118; Tuplin 1987, 60; Lendle 1995, 315–316.

²⁴ The text is cited from Hude–Peters 1971. For the variants see Tuplin 1987, 61–62.

Regardless of reading ἔφευγεν or ἔφυγεν and understanding the conjunction as temporal or casual, it appears that the exile is represented as a new state of affairs originating after Xenophon had left the money to Megabyzus – that is, not earlier than in 394, although possibly before the Battle of Coronea.²⁵

Finally, we know that Xenophon spent part of the booty-tithe received in 400 BC for a votive offering to Apollo in Delphi; he had his ἀνάθημα erected in the Athenian treasury (*Anab.* 5. 3. 5), which likely proves that he was still an Athenian citizen while making this dedication.²⁶ This would put his banishment to some time later than 399. Yet, the dedication itself cannot be dated with any certainty. Some scholars believe that Xenophon could only have had time to come to Delphi soon after the Battle of Coronea, together with Agesilaus in the second part of August 394 (*Xen. Hell.* 4. 3. 21);²⁷ others argue that he could either have visited the sanctuary in the previous years,²⁸ or delivered the ἀνάθημα not in person (cf. ἔπεμψεν in *Diog. L.* 2. 51).²⁹ In any case we are not forced by the evidence to assume that Xenophon visited his native city in 399–397, even if he was not yet banished, and in the following years, 396–394, the probability of such a visit becomes especially small.

Be that as it may, solving this problem is not of decisive importance for the present inquiry, since it can only result in the determination of the moment when Xenophon got the last look at Athens, before leaving it for several decades, eight years earlier (401) or later (394). It is more significant to establish whether Xenophon had ever returned to Athens after the amnesty and if he did, when exactly.

The alliance of Athens with Sparta which resulted in Xenophon's amnesty followed in 369.³⁰ The view that he had still never come back to his homeland is based on two assertions of ancient authors. Diogenes Laertius says that he *sent* his two sons to Athens to take part in the Battle of Mantinea (2. 53: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ψηφισαμένων Ἀθηναίων βοηθεῖν Λακεδαιμονίοις ἔπεμψε τοὺς παῖδας εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας στρατευσομένους

²⁵ Tuplin 1987, 61–63. Schwartz 1936, 144 considered *Anab.* 7. 7. 57 and 5. 3. 6–7 to be contradicting one another and thus proposed eliminating 7. 7. 57 as an interpolation.

²⁶ Croiset 1873, 262; Rahn 1981, 116; Tuplin 1987, 64; Badian 2004, 41; Dreher 2004, 64.

²⁷ Breitenbach 1967, 1575; Lendle 1995, 314; Badian 2004, 41, Dreher 2004, 63–64.

²⁸ Croiset 1873, 262 suggests a trip to Delphi in 398–397 BC.

²⁹ Tuplin 1987, 64–65.

³⁰ See e.g. Delebecque 1957, 334.

ὑπὲρ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων) which implies that he himself remained absent from Athens in that period. The same author relates the claim of Demetrius of Magnesia that Xenophon died in Corinth in a very old age (*ibid.* 56: τέθνηκε δ' ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ὡς φησι Δημήτριος ὁ Μάγνης, ἤδη δηλαδὴ γηραιὸς ἱκανῶς).

One cannot but agree with Delebecque³¹ that this evidence does not yet rule out Xenophon's reunion with his motherland in some moment between these two periods. However, it is enough to accept that Xenophon remained away from Athens before the Battle of Mantinea and that he had been working on treatise *On Horsemanship* exactly in that period, to make a conclusion that the last time he had seen Simon's bronze horse was before his banishment.

Delebecque heatedly argues that the aged Athenian patriot did not miss the opportunity to return as soon as possible.³² Yet the same scholar thinks that Xenophon made the reference to Simon in his Scyllus period.³³ Accepting Delebecque's construction as a whole we reach the same conclusion – namely, that the dedication of Simon was already on its place in front of the Eleusinion by the moment Xenophon left Athens about the turn of the fifth to the fourth century BC.

A close link between Simon's book and his monument suggests itself. Many ancient dedications to the gods deal with professional activity: in this way dedicators sought to acquire divine protection for their work or thanked the gods for their success.³⁴ The statue ordered by Simon clearly shows that he regarded his career as related to the horses. The same is suggested by the wording of Xenophon (*De re equ.* 1. 1): ἵππικὸς ὢν. Nevertheless, there is no way of stating what precisely his professional activity was. Some scholars have considered Simon a veterinarian,³⁵

³¹ Delebecque 1957, 334–335.

³² Delebecque 1957, 334–341.

³³ Identifying the location of the monument in front of the Eleusinion, Xenophon takes trouble to specify that the temple implied is the one located in Athens. According to Delebecque 1957, 244, such accuracy proves that the author himself was absent from Athens, as he wrote these words. However, this impression may be misleading: an author settled in Athens could just as well insert a reference to his own polis, if he hoped to find readers among the citizens of other poleis as well.

³⁴ E.g., the craftsmen of the Kerameikos dedicated clay plaques with images of their work to Poseidon and Amphitrite (Boardman 1998, 185, Fig. 409. 1–4). Artists dedicated tripods won at the competitions to the gods, e.g. Hesiod to the Muses of Helicon (Hes. *OD* 656–658), aulode Echembrotus to Heracles in Thebes (Paus. 10. 7. 5–6), rhapsode Terpsicles to Zeus in Dodona (*SGDI* 5786).

³⁵ Gossen 1927, 180.

others a cavalry commander.³⁶ Xenophon's expression τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργα can be interpreted in the broadest possible sense: as reference to Simon's talents, to anything he knew well how to do.³⁷ Apparently writing an influential treatise on horses was a consequence of the same professional self-identification.

Of course, we cannot be sure that the edition of Simon's treatise preceded the installation of the statue. However, this is plausible, especially if one considers the bronze horse as a kind of illustration to Simon's work. Indeed, such an idea has been expressed both in ancient and in modern times. Hierocles (fourth or fifth cent. AD), one of the authors featuring in the *Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum*, who retells Xenophon's testimony in his own words, interprets his expression τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργα as a reference to Simon's treatise (*CHG* B 1. 11):

τά τε <Σίμωνος> ἀκούεις τοῦ παλαοῦ τοὺς τῆς ἵππασίας αὐτοῦ τρόπους ἐν τῷ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις Ἐλευσινίῳ χαράξαντος καὶ σημήναντος ἐν τοῖς σχήμασι.

You are also familiar with the work of Simon who lived in ancient times, the one who near the Eleusinion in Athens carved and showed with pictures his riding style.

E. Curtius suggested that the bronze statue could embody the ideal proportions of a horse, just like the *Doryphoros* of Polyclitus demonstrated the ideal body shape of an athlete.³⁸

Anyway, by the time the statue was dedicated (which is probably before 401 BC) Simon was an adult and successful person with some ἔργα to be proud of. Therefore, the time of his activity could not significantly exceed the second half of the fifth century BC.

Valeria Petrova
Saint Petersburg State University
st062805@student.spbu.ru

³⁶ Helbig 1861, 182; Soukup 1911, 34.

³⁷ Lenormant 1856, 60.

³⁸ Curtius 1891, 188. This assumption is not very convincing, since accomplishing the ideal would have depended entirely of the sculptor – Simon had but limited possibilities to influence him. Perhaps the artist was Demetrius of Alopece, if the testimony of Plinius, *NH* 34. 76 (*idem* [sc. *Demetrius fecit*] *equitem S<i>monem qui primus de equitatu scripsit*) refers to the same monument, but Plinius relates of a statue of Simon on horseback – probably by mistake.

Bibliography

- E. Badian, “Xenophon the Athenian”, in: C. J. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and his World*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 172 (Stuttgart 2004) 33–54.
- F. Blass, “Simonis Atheniensis de re equestri libri fragmentum nuper repertum”, in: *Liber miscellaneus editus a societate philologica Bonnensi [Festschrift für Friedrich Ritschl]* (Bonn 1864) 49–59.
- J. Boardman, *Early Greek Vase Painting* (London 1998).
- H. R. Breitenbach, “Xenophon (6): Xenophon von Athen”, *RE* 9 A (1967) 1569–1928, 1981/2–2051, 2502.
- L. Canfora, *Storie di oligarchi* (Palermo 1983).
- W. von Christ, W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* I (München 1912).
- A. Croiset, *Xénophon. Son caractère et son talent* (Paris 1873).
- E. Curtius, *Die Stadtgeschichte von Athen* (Berlin 1891).
- Ch. Daremberg, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits médicaux grecs, latins et français, des principales bibliothèques de l'Europe* (Paris 1853).
- É. Delebecque (ed., tr.), *Xénophon. De l'Art équestre* (Paris 1950).
- É. Delebecque, *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon* (Paris 1957).
- L. Dindorf (ed.), *Xenophontis opuscula politica, equestria et venatica, cum Arriani libello de Venatione* (Oxford 1866).
- M. Dreher, “Der Prozess gegen Xenophon”, in: C. J. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and his World*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 172 (Stuttgart 2004) 55–70.
- H. Gossen, “Simo 16”, *RE* 2. R. 3 (1927) 180.
- G. Grote, *History of Greece* IX (London 1861).
- W. Helbig, “Simon der Hippolog”, *Archaeologische Zeitung* 19 (1861) 180–184.
- C. Hude, J. Peters (eds.), *Xenophontis Expeditio Cyri* (Leipzig 1972).
- F. Klett, *Zu Xenophons Leben*, Progr. (Schwerin 1900).
- C. W. Krüger, *De Xenophontis vita quaestiones criticae* (Halle 1822).
- J. W. I. Lee, *A Greek Army on the March. Soldiers and Survival in Xenophon's Anabasis* (Cambridge 2008).
- O. Lendle, *Kommentar zu Xenophons Anabasis (Bücher 1–7)* (Darmstadt 1995).
- Ch. Lenormant, *Mémoire sur la manière de lire Pausanias, à propos du véritable emplacement de l'Agora d'Athènes* (Paris 1856).
- A. J. Letronne, *Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Xénophon* (Paris s.a. [ca. 1825]).
- G. Lippold, “Mikon 2”, *RE* 15 (1932) 1557–1561.
- A. McCabe, *A Byzantine Encyclopaedia of Horse Medicine: The Sources, Compilation, and Transmission of the Hippitrica* (Oxford 2007).
- W. Mure, *A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece* IV (London 1857).
- A. Nicolai, “Über die Verbannung des Xenophon”, *Jahrbuch für classische Philologie* 89 (1864) 811–823.
- B. G. Niebuhr, “Über Xenophons Hellenika”, in: id., *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften* (Berlin 1828) 464–482.
- E. Oder, “De Hippitricorum codice Cantabrigiensi”, *RhM* 51 (1896a) 52–69.

- E. Oder, “Ad Simonis Atheniensis fragmentum (p. 67–69) addendum”, *RhM* 51 (1896b) 311–314.
- E. Oder, *Anecdota Cantabrigiensia. Pars I: De Hippiatricorum codice Cantabrigiensis*, Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Friedrichswerderschen Gymnasiums zu Berlin (Berlin 1896c).
- E. Oder, K. Hoppe (eds.), *Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum. I: Hippiatrica Berolinensia. II: Hippiatrica Parisina, Excerpta Lugdunensia* (Leipzig 1924–1927).
- G. Pierleoni (ed.), *Xenophontis opuscula politica, equestria et venatica* (Rome 1937).
- P. J. Rahn, “The Date of Xenophon’s Exile”, in: G. S. Shrimpton, D. J. McCargar (eds.), *Classical Contributions. Studies in Honor of M. F. McGregor* (Locust Valley, NY 1981) 103–119.
- A. Roquette, *De Xenophontis vita*, Diss. (Königsberg 1884).
- F. Rühl (ed.), *Xenophontis scripta minora* (Leipzig 1912).
- A. Sestili, *L’equitazione nella Grecia antica. I trattati equestri di Senofonte e i frammenti di Simone* (Florence 2006).
- J. Soukup, *De libello Simonis Atheniensis ‘de re equestri’* (Innsbruck 1911).
- E. Schwartz, “Quellenuntersuchungen zur griechischen Geschichte” (1889), in: id., *Gesammelte Schriften* II (Berlin 1936) 136–174.
- Ch. J. Tuplin, “Xenophon’s Exile Again”, in: M. Whitby et al. (eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol 1987) 59–68.
- K. Widdra (ed.), *Xenophontis De re equestri* (Leipzig 1964).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin 1881).

The fragment of Simon of Athens entitled *περὶ εἶδους καὶ ἐπιλογῆς ἵππων* is of interest as one of the earliest specimens of Attic prose and the first technical treatise dealing with horses. As the text itself does not contain any evidence which would allow establishing the author’s lifetime, scholars tend to date the passage to ca. 450–362 relying on Xen. *De re equ.* 1. 1, where Simon’s work is mentioned as one of the sources. Xenophon says that his predecessor dedicated a statue of a horse in Athens and had his deeds carved on its base. Simon’s monument seems to be so well-known that Xenophon mentioned it in order to identify the person in question. This paper argues that the timeframe can be made still narrower, the biography of Xenophon accurately analysed from the moment he left Athens for Asia in 401 BC. It is highly likely that he only returned home many years later (if ever), after having written that part of the treatise where Simon was mentioned. Thus, he had the last chance to see the statue as a young man (in 401 and earlier). Therefore, not the time of writing *De re equestri*, but Xenophon’s departure from Athens can be considered as the *terminus ante quem* for Simon’s activity.

Фрагмент Симона Афинского о выборе лошадей интересен как один из самых ранних образцов аттической прозы и как первый известный греческий трактат, посвященный лошадям. Поскольку в тексте не содержится сведений,

которые бы позволили определить время жизни автора, исследователи датируют фрагмент ок. 450–362 гг. до н. э. на основании Xep. *De re equi*. 1, 1, где Симон упоминается как один из источников. Ксенофонт сообщает, что его предшественник установил в Афинах скульптуру лошади, на постаменте которой изображались его деяния. Судя по всему, статуя была достаточно известна, чтобы при ее упоминании читатель понял, о каком Симоне идет речь. Представляется, что временные рамки можно сузить, проанализировав биографию Ксенофонта с того момента, когда он отправляется в Азию в 401 г. Велика вероятность, что, покинув Афины, Ксенофонт если и вернулся на родину, то много лет спустя, уже после написания той части трактата, в которой упоминается Симон, так что последняя возможность увидеть статую была у него еще в молодости (401 г. и ранее). Таким образом, в качестве *terminus ante quem* для времени деятельности Симона можно рассматривать не время написания *De re equestri*, а отъезд Ксенофонта из Афин.

Carlo M. Lucarini

TEXTKRITISCHES
ZU AGATHARCHIDES VON KNIDOS
UND ZU MARKIANOS VON HERAKLEA*

Im Rahmen meiner geplanten Sammlung der kleinen und fragmentarischen Geographen des Altertums (*Geographi antiqui vel minores vel quorum fragmenta exstant*) habe ich mich mit dem Text des Agatharchides von Knidos (2. Jh. v. Ch.) und des Markianos von Heraklea (nach Ptolemaios) beschäftigt. Hier werde ich versuchen, einige Stellen zu emendieren.

Agatharchides, *De mari Erythraeo* 7, S. 140 Henry:¹

Καὶ τῶ μὲν Ὀρφεῖ κιθαρίζοντι διὰ φιλομουσίαν τὰ ὄρη καὶ τὰς πέτρας ἀκολουθεῖν, κρέα δὲ ὀπτώμενα τῶν Ἡλίου βοῶν φωνὴν προϊέσθαι ἀνθρώποις συνετήν. Τῶν δὲ μετηλλαχότων τὸν βίον ἐπὶ σχολῆς πρὸς Ὀδυσσεὰ διεξέρχεται παντοδαπὴ ἀδολεσχίαν.

Der partitive Genitiv τῶν μετηλλαχότων τὸν βίον braucht einen Akkusativ, und ich würde τὸν βίον <τινάς> ἐπὶ σχολῆς schreiben.

Ebenda 50, S. 165 Henry:

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἀπηγγέλθω τοῦ παραδόξου χάριν· τί γὰρ ιδιώτερον ἢ λέοντας μὲν ἐκχωρεῖν κώνωψιν, ἀνθρώπους δὲ σφάζεσθαι ὑπὸ τοιοῦτου κινδύνου;

Aus dem Vorhergehenden ergibt sich, daß das παράδοξον darin besteht, dass das Mückensummen die Löwen (die sonst die Menschen angreifen) vertreibt: nicht die schlichte Tatsache, dass die Menschen den Löwen entkommen, sondern dass sie das dem Mückensummen zu verdanken haben, ist für Agatharchides/Photios verwunderlich. Ich würde δὲ <οὔτω> σφάζεσθαι schreiben.

* Ich bedanke mich bei Herrn Kollege Dr. D. Keyer (Sankt Petersburg), der mir seine Beobachtungen mitgeteilt hat.

¹ Text nach Henry 1974.

Ebenda 71, S. 174 Henry:

Ἵτι ὁ ῥινόκερος ἐλέφαντος μὲν οὐ λείπεται, τῷ δὲ ὕψει καταδεέστερος ὑπάρχει. Χρῶμα δὲ ἔχει πύξω παρεμφερὲς εὐτελεῖ καὶ τὴν ἀφήν τοῦ δέρματος.

Schon eine sorgfältige Lektüre des abgeschriebenen Abschnittes legt nahe, dass etwas ausgefallen ist. Man könnte an ἐλέφαντος <μήκει> μὲν denken,² aber die Parallelstelle bei Diodorus (3, 71) spricht für eine andere Lösung:

ἔστι γὰρ ζῷον ὃ καλεῖται μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ συμβεβηκότος ῥινόκερος, ἀλκῆ δὲ καὶ βία παραπλήσιον ἐλέφαντι, τῷ δὲ ὕψει ταπεινότερον. Τὴν μὲν δορὰν ἰσχυροτέραν ἔχει, τὴν δὲ χροῶν πυξοειδῆ.

Ich würde ergänzen: ἐλέφαντος <ἀλκῆ> μὲν ... καὶ <ἰσχυρὰν> τὴν ἀφήν.

Ebenda 80, S. 177 Henry:

Ἐἴτα ἀπὸ τῆς λίμνης συμβέβληκεν ὁ Νεῖλος, ὄχετοῦ διὰ τινων ἀραιωμάτων εἰς τὸν κοιλότατον ὑπερθέοντος τόπον.

Statt ὑπερθέοντος ist vielleicht ὑπορρέοντος zu schreiben.

Ebenda 82, S. 178 Henry:

Ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ πρὸς μέρος περιπολοῦσιν, ἔχοντες παντοίας τοῖς μεγέθεσι σκαφίδας. Ὁ δὲ ἐν ταῖς πέτραις λίθος τὴν μὲν ἡμέραν ὑπὸ τοῦ φέγγους κρατούμενος διὰ τὸ πνίγος οὐ γίνεται σύνδηλος· σκότου δὲ ἐπιστάντος, ἐν ᾧ ποτ' ἂν ἦ πεφυκώς, διαλάμπει πάντοθεν. Ὁ δὲ συνιδῶν φύλαξ τηλικούτον περιέθηκεν ἄγγος σημείου χάριν περὶ τὸ διαστίλβον, ἠλίκον ἂν ἦ τοῦ θεωρουμένου φαντάσματος τὸ μέγεθος· εἴτα τὴν ἡμέραν ἐπερχόμενος, ἰσοπληθῆ τῇ προειρημένῃ περιτεμὼν πέτραν, τοῖς ἐκλαίνειν δυναμένοις τεχνίταις παραδίδωσιν.

noctu divisus agminibus circumvagantur, vasis ligneis variae magnitudinis instructi. Nam intra petras lapis interdum quia a luce superatur propter solis splendorem non fit manifestus, sed ingruente noctis umbra, ubicumque loci nascitur, ab omni parte resplendet. Quo observato custos signi causa id quod splendet tanto circumdat vase, quantum visae imaginis magnitudinem esse arbitratur. Per diurnam postea lucem

² Vgl. Burstein 1989, 119, der allerdings keinen Texteingriff vorschlägt.

accedens, quum aequalem priori designationi partem saxi exciderit, magistris laevigandi peritis segmentum tradit.³

Ich finde ἰσοπληθῆ τῆ προειρημένη problematisch; das Partizip bezieht sich offensichtlich auf σκαφίς, aber ich glaube nicht, daß dieses Substantiv unausgesprochen bleiben kann, zumal das Synonyme ἄγγος im dazwischenliegenden Text vorkommt. Darüber hinaus ist ἰσοπληθῆ („equal in number or quantity“ LSJ, „pari copia vel numero“ Stephanus) befremdlich. Ich würde den Text auf die folgende Weise wiederherstellen: ἰσοπλατῆ („equal in breadth“) τῆ προειρημένη <σκαφίδι> περιτεµών.

Ebenda 84, S. 179 Henry:

τῆς δὲ χώρας ἡ μὲν εἰς τὴν μεσόγειον ἀνατείνουσα πλήρης ἐλεφάντων καὶ ῥινοκέρων καὶ ταύρων καὶ ὕδν.

Ῥινόκερωσ gehört zur dritten Deklination, und wir müssen deswegen ῥινοκερώ<τω>ν schreiben.

Ebenda 95, Ss. 181–182 Henry:

Ὅτι τὴν ἀστυγείτονα τῆς ὀρεινῆς χέρσου Δεβαὶ κατοικοῦσιν, οἱ μὲν νομάδες, οἱ δὲ γεοῦχοι. Ἰνὰ κατὰ μέσην τὴν χώραν ποταμὸς διαφέρεται τριμερῆς μὲν τῆ φύσει, ψῆγμα δὲ χρυσοῦ κατάγων οὕτω σύνδηλον τὴν δαψίλειαν ἔχων ὥστε τὴν ἰλὸν τὴν πρὸς ταῖς ἐκβολαῖς συνηγμένην πόρρωθεν ἀποστίλβειν. Οἱ δὲ τὸν τόπον οἰκοῦντες τῆς μὲν ἐργασίας εἰσὶ τῆς τοιαύτης ἄπειροι· φιλόξενοι δὲ εἰς ὑπερβολὴν οὐ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπὸ Πελοποννήσου διεκβάλλουσι καὶ Βοιωτίας διὰ τινὰ μυθικὴν ἀφ’ Ἡρακλέους ἱστορίαν.

Ist vielleicht δαψίλειαν in διάλαμψιν zu emendieren? (Vgl. Diod. 3, 3, 8: διαλάμπει καὶ πόρρωθεν δῆλός ἐστιν). Statt διεκβάλλουσι („march through“ LSJ) würde man διαβάλλουσι („pass over, cross“) erwarten.

Ebenda 97, S. 183 Henry:

Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς μεσογείου δρυμοὶ συνεχεῖς στείχουσι καὶ μεγάλοι.

Στείχω (ein überwiegend poetisches Verb) bedeutet „walk, march in line“ (LSJ), aber die Wälder bewegen sich nicht. Ich würde schreiben στοιχοῦσι („to be in rows“).

³ Übersetzung von Müller 1855, 171.

Ebenda 99, S. 184 Henry:

οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ κάπειδ' οὐ δύνωνται τὴν ζωὴν παιδαγωγεῖν παραπλησίως
εὐσταθῆ, διαπνεομένου τοῦ σώματος ὑπ' ἀκράτου καὶ τμητικῆς δυνάμεως
καὶ τὴν σύμμετρον πύκνωσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἀγούσης ὥστε ἄγειν εἰς ἔκλυσιν
ἐσχάτην.

ἀγούσης ist mir unverstündlich; vielleicht ἀραιούσης?

Ebenda 102, S. 186 Henry:

εἰ δὲ μὴ πόρρω διεστηκυῖαν τὴν οἴκησιν κατεῖχον τῶν ἐπὶ πάντα τόπον τὰς
δυνάμεις στρεφόντων, οἰκονόμοι τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἂν ὑπῆρχον οἱ κύριοι
τῶν ἰδίων ἄθλων, τῆς ῥαθυμίας ἀδυνατούσης τὸ ἐλεύθερον πλεῖω χρόνον
διατηρεῖν.

Στρεφόντων passt keineswegs in den Zusammenhang; man würde τρεπόν-
των erwarten.

Marcianus, *Periplus maris externi* 1, 15:⁴

Τῶν δὲ ἀριστερῶν τῆς Ἀσίας μερῶν ἢ τῆς ἠπείρου καὶ τῶν θαλασσῶν
θέσις τοῦτόν πως διάκειται τὸν τρόπον (χρὴ γὰρ κἀνταῦθα πρὸ τῶν κατὰ
μέρος ὀνομασιῶν τὰς καθόλου δηλῶσαι προσηγορίας καὶ τὴν θέσιν
σημῆναι τῶν τόπων). Πλέοντι τοίνυν τὸν Ἀράβιον κόλπον καὶ ἀριστερὰν
ἔχοντι τὴν ἡπειρον πρώτη μὲν ἐστὶν ἢ καλουμένη Εὐδαίμων Ἀραβία
παρὰ ὄλον τὸν Ἀράβιον διήκουσα κόλπον μέχρι τοῦ προρρηθέντος
Ἀραβίου πορθμοῦ.

Πλέοντι ist zu vage, und wir brauchen etwas, das die Schifffahrtsrichtung
bestimmt. Da die Fahrt in Nord-Süd-Richtung fortgeht, sodass das Schiff
das Rote Meer verlässt, konjiziere ich <ἐκ>πλέοντι τοίνυν τὸν Ἀράβιον
κόλπον, vgl. *Per. mar. ext.* 1, 12 (ἐκπλεύσαντι δὲ τὸν κόλπον καὶ τὴν
Ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν); 2, 3 (ἐκπλέοντι γὰρ τὸν Ἡράκλειον πορθμὸν καὶ
πρὸς τὸν ὠκεανὸν ἐπειγομένῳ).

Ebenda 1, 16:

Εἴθ' ἐξῆς τὸ τῶν Σινῶν ἐστὶν ἔθνος καὶ ἡ τούτων μητρόπολις, ἣτις Θῖναι
προσαγορεύεται, ὄριον τῆς ἐγνωσμένης γῆς καὶ ἀγνώστου τυγχάνουσα.

⁴ Text nach Müller 1855. B. M. Altomare hat eine neue kritische Ausgabe
schon 2010 angekündigt, vgl. academia.edu/8770681/FOR_A_NEW_CRITICAL_EDITION_OF_MARCIANUS_OF_HERACLEA. Vgl. auch Marcotte 2000.

Ich würde καὶ <τῆς> ἀγνώστου ergänzen, vgl. *Per. mar. ext.* 1, 37 (ὄριον εἶναι τῆς ἐκτὸς Γάγγου Ἰνδικῆς καὶ τῆς ἐκτός).

Ebenda 17 a:

Ἡ Εὐδαίμων Ἀραβία περιορίζεται ἀπὸ μὲν ἄρκτων ταῖς πλευραῖς τῆς τε Πετραίας Ἀραβίας καὶ ἐτι τῆς Ἐρήμου Ἀραβίας καὶ τῷ νοτιῷ μέρει τοῦ Περσικοῦ κόλπου μέχρι τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ Τίγριδος ποταμοῦ, <ἀπὸ δὲ ἀνατολῶν μέρει τε τοῦ Περσικοῦ κόλπου> καὶ μέρει τῆς Ἰνδικῆς θαλάσσης, ἀπὸ δὲ μεσημβρίας τῆ Ἐρυθρᾶ θαλάσσης, <ἀπὸ δὲ δύσεως τῷ Ἀραβίῳ κόλπῳ>. Τὴν δὲ θέσιν τοιαύτην τινὰ ἔχει.

Die Ergänzungen stammen von Müller (vgl. Ptolem. *Geogr.* 6, 7, 1): auf diese Weise würden Arabiens Grenzen in der Reihenfolge Nord-Ost-Süd-West beschrieben. Ich würde den Text auf die folgende Weise wiederherstellen: τοῦ Τίγριδος ποταμοῦ, <ἀπὸ δὲ δύσεως τῷ Ἀραβίῳ κόλπῳ, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀνατολῆς μέρει τε τοῦ Περσικοῦ κόλπου> καὶ μέρει τῆς Ἰνδικῆς θαλάσσης, ἀπὸ δὲ μεσημβρίας τῆ Ἐρυθρᾶ θαλάσσης. Diese Rekonstruktion zeigt einen evidenten Vorteil gegenüber derjenigen von Müller, indem sie nur einen Textausfall voraussetzt. Hinzu kommt, dass die von mir konjizierte Beschreibungsfolge (Nord-West-Ost-Süd) auch anderswo vorkommt (*Per. mar. ext.* 1, 20; 1, 23; 1, 26).

Ebenda 46:

Τῶν δὲ σταδίων τοῦ περίπλου τούτου τὸν ἀριθμὸν οὐ ῥάδιον ἀναγράψαι. Ἔσται δὲ μηδεὶ ἀλλῷ εὐμαρὲς <τὸν> ἐχόμενον περίπλου <τὸν> μετὰ τὸν Σινῶν ὄρμον δηλῶσαι σαφῶς ἢ θείῳ τινὶ γνώστῃ, μήτε τὰ πρὸς τῇ μεσημβρίᾳ παρὰ τὴν ἀγνωστον διήκοντα γῆν σαφῆ καταστήναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, μήτε τὴν παρὰ τὴν ἐφᾶν μετὰ τοὺς Σίνας ἀγνωστον γῆν.

Ich glaube, dass καταστήναι mit dem aktiven Aorist καταστήσαι ersetzt werden muss, vgl. *Eus. Praep. Evan.* 6, 10, 50 (τάδε σοὶ σαφῆ καταστήσω).

Ebenda 2, 18:

Ὁ μὲν οὖν τῆς Ἰβηρίας περίπλους ὁ παρὰ τὸν ὠκεανὸν τὸν δυτικὸν καὶ τὸν ἄρκτων τυγχάνων ἀπὸ τῆς Κάλπης τοῦ ὄρους καὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου πορθμοῦ μέχρι τῆς Πυρήνης τοῦ ὄρους καὶ τοῦ πέρατος αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἄρκτου, τοῦ καλουμένου Οἰάσσω, τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον.

Ich würde ergänzen: τοῦ ἄρκτου, <τοῦ ἀκρωτηρίου> τοῦ καλουμένου Οἰάσσω, vgl. *Per. mar. ext.* 2, 16 (ἀπὸ τοῦ Οἰάσσω τῆς Πυρήνης

ἀκρωτηρίου) 2, 18 (ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκρωτήριον τῆς Πυρήνης τὸ Οἰάσσω λεγόμενον); *ibid.* (μέχρι τοῦ Οἰάσσου ἀκρωτηρίου τῆς Πυρήνης); 2, 20 (κατὰ τὸ Οἰάσσω ἀκρωτήριον); 2, 21 (ἀπὸ τοῦ Οἰάσσω ἀκρωτηρίου τῆς Πυρήνης).

Ebenda 2, 36:

Ἔχει δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ [scil. Germania] ἔθνη ξη΄, πόλεις ἐπισήμους 48΄, ὄρη ἐπίσημα ζ΄, ποταμοὺς ἐπισήμους ιδ΄, Κιμβρικήν χερσόνησον, λιμένα ἐπίσημον, Ὀρκύνιον δρυμόν, Γαβρήταν ὕλην.

Wir müssen λιμένα ἐπίσημον <α΄> ergänzen, vgl. *Per. mar. ext.* 1, 25 (ἀκρωτήριον ἐπίσημον α΄); 1, 33 (ὄρος μέγιστον α΄, ποταμόν μέγαν α΄, λιμένα ἐπίσημον α΄); 1, 36 (αἰγιαλὸν μέγαν α΄); 1, 38 (λιμένα ἐπίσημον α΄); 1, 47 (ὄρος ἐπίσημον α΄); 2, 10 (λιμένα ἐπίσημον α΄).

Marcianus, *Epitome peripli Menippeï* 3:⁵

Ἀμέλει τῆς μὲν Εὐρώπης τὸ Τυρρηνικὸν πέλαγος ἀτελῶς περιέπλευσε [scilicet Timosthenes Rhodius], τὰ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἡράκλειον πορθμὸν οὔτε τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς οὔτε τῆς ἔξω θαλάσσης ἴσχυσε γνῶναι. Ταῦτά δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην πέπονθεν, ἀπὸ τῆς Καρχηδόνας πάντας τοὺς ἐπέκεινα περὶ τὸν Ἡράκλειον πορθμὸν περὶ τε τὴν ἔξω θάλασσαν ἀγνοήσας τόπους.

Nach ἀπὸ τῆς Καρχηδόνας πάντας τοὺς ἐπέκεινα lautet die Wiederholung der Worte περὶ τὸν Ἡράκλειον πορθμὸν περὶ τε τὴν ἔξω θάλασσαν als eine unangebrachte Begrenzung, die die ganze nordafrikanische Küste von Karthago bis Gibraltar ausschliesst: es handelt sich, glaube ich, um eine Interpolation.

Ebenda 5:

Πάντες, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ὅσοι περίπλους ἔγραψαν, περὶ μὲν τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ χωρία καὶ λιμένας καὶ νήσους ἢ οὐδὲν ὄλως ἢ βραχέα τινὰ καὶ ῥαδίας τῆς διορθώσεως ἀξιοθῆναι δυνάμενα διεφώνησαν· περὶ δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σταδίων τῶν αὐτῶν πόλεων καὶ νήσων καὶ λιμένων πολλὴν τινα διαφορὰν ἐποιήσαντο.

Es spring sofort in die Augen, dass die χωρία in der zweiten Liste unerwähnt bleiben; wenn man denkt, dass in unserem einzigen Überlieferungsträger

⁵ Zu diesem Text vgl. auch Diller 1952, 147 ff.

(*Par. suppl. Gr.* 443) ein Seitenwechsel nach πόλεων eintritt (F. 54–55), so wird jeder mir zustimmen, dass die Ergänzung πόλεων <καὶ χωρίων> καὶ νήσων sehr wahrscheinlich ist.

Carlo M. Lucarini
Palermo
carlo.lucarini@unipa.it

Bibliographie

- S. M. Burstein (Komm.), *Agatharchides of Cnidos, On the Erythraean Sea* (London 1989).
A. Diller, *The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers* (Oxford 1952).
R. Henry (Hg.), *Photius, Bibliothèque VII* (Paris 1974).
D. Marcotte (Hg.), *Géographes grecs I* (Paris 2000).
C. Müller (Hg.), *Geographi Graeci minores I* (Paris 1855).

The aim of this paper is to shed new light on some passages of Agatharchides of Cnidos and Marcian of Heraclea. A new textual arrangement is proposed for ten passages of Agatharchides and eight of Marcian.

В статье предлагаются новые чтения для десяти пассажей Агатархида Книдского и восьми пассажей Маркиана Гераклеяского.

Sofia Larionova

QUADRIVIUM IN VARRO'S *DISCIPLINES**

Introduction

Since the time of Archytas, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and harmonics had been perceived as kindred μαθήματα (47 B 1 DK).¹ Similar views were shared by Archytas's friend Plato, who considered these sciences a crucial part of the education of the guardians in the ideal state (*Resp.* 521 d – 531 d). We also know of some Pythagoreans and Sophists who taught four μαθήματα, such as Theodorus of Cyrene (*Theaet.* 145 a) and Hippias of Elis (*Prot.* 318 e). Scholars have suggested that the educational curriculum of the *Republic* was not that far from the real one used in the Academy or elsewhere² – overlooking the fact that Plato's model represented an ideal and did not provide an accurate description of any existing curriculum. Plato mostly appreciated μαθήματα as a tool useful for turning guardians' souls to dialectics (*Resp.* 521 c, 532 b–c). His older contemporary Isocrates viewed μαθήματα as a stepping stone on the way to further education, as mathematical subjects were a sort of “gymnastics of the mind” (*Ant.* 261–268). Thus, the quadrivium (both scientific and educational) was born in the fourth century BCE.

Still, the role of μαθήματα in the ancient post-school education³ of the Classical and Hellenistic periods was quite limited, with an emphasis being put instead on rhetoric and philosophy.⁴ Although some teachers of rhetoric and philosophy (namely Isocrates, Aristotle, Xenocrates,⁵ and

* This article was prepared within the framework of Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) research project No 20-011-00-509.

¹ Huffman 2005, 64; Zhmud 2006, 62–63.

² Cherniss 1945, 66–67; Kühnert 1961, 72–73, 112–117.

³ The post-school mathematical education is understood here as a type of education undertaken after completing the standard school curriculum. It could have been pursued for its own sake or, more commonly, as προπαιδευμα to other studies, such as law, rhetoric, philosophy, etc.

⁴ Marrou 1964; Clarke 1971; Bonner 1977; Barrow 2015, 286–289.

⁵ DL 4. 10: “To someone who had never learnt music, geometry, or astronomy, but nevertheless wished to attend his lectures, Xenocrates said: ‘Go your ways, for you offer philosophy nothing to lay hold of’” (tr. Hicks 1925, 385).

Arcesilaus⁶) considered a certain level of knowledge in mathematical subjects useful, there is still no positive evidence to suggest that during the Hellenistic period the mathematical sciences were taught on a regular basis not only to specialists, but also to a wider audience. However, H.-I. Marrou has supported the view that the circle of the seven *artes liberales* had already been formed in the Hellenistic period.⁷ At some point during the Hellenistic period, there must have appeared a mathematical education directed not only at professionals, as suggested by the existence of popular introductions into mathematical disciplines, e.g. Geminus' *Introduction to the Phenomena* (first century BCE). The first Roman author to document this change was the encyclopedic writer Varro (first century BCE), in whose writings traces of the Greek tradition can be found.

Varro was most probably the first to have unified what later became known as the trivium (grammar, dialectic, rhetoric⁸) and the quadrivium (geometry, arithmetic, astronomy and harmonics) in one now lost encyclopedic work. Varro's *Disciplines* has been regarded as a link between Greek and Roman educational practices. Hellfried Dahlmann has described it as the "vielleicht einflußreichste Werk Varros", arguing that the Greek *artes liberales* did not have a constant number and order, and that Varro's major achievement was to define them.⁹ Meanwhile, according to Friedmar Kühnert, all later encyclopedias depended on Varro, whether directly or indirectly.¹⁰ Since very little is known of the content of Varro's *Disciplines*, it is not clear whether the work was intended to be a coursebook for use in a classroom, or rather a popular book for self-educational purposes. The word *disciplina* itself denotes instruction and teaching in the widest sense of the word; metonymically it can also mean all that is taught in the way of instruction.¹¹

In late Antiquity, under the influence of Varro's *Disciplines*, the quadrivium was incorporated into the works of Augustine,¹² Cassiodorus,¹³

⁶ Arcesilaus himself was a pupil of the mathematician Autolycus (DL 4. 29), the musician Xanthus, and the geometer Hipponicus (*ib.* 32). Moreover, he was annoyed with any who took up their studies too late (*ib.* 36).

⁷ Marrou 1969, 12.

⁸ Grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic as an educational unity first appear among the Stoics, who considered them components of logic.

⁹ Dahlmann 1935, 1255; 1257.

¹⁰ Kühnert 1961, 67.

¹¹ See Lewis–Short 1879, 587 s.v. *disciplina*.

¹² D'Alessandro 1997, 357–370; Shanzer 2005, 69–95; Gasti 2017, 303–318.

¹³ D'Alessandro 1997; Schindel 2006, 99–108.

Martianus Capella,¹⁴ and Isidore of Seville,¹⁵ and hence made its way into medieval pedagogy. Reconstructing the work's content and book order was attempted, among others, by Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl,¹⁶ whose influence on later traditions is hard to overestimate.¹⁷ However, Ritschl's reconstruction, together with Marrou's thesis that the circle of seven liberal arts was already extant in the Hellenistic period, have been severely criticized by Ilsetraut Hadot, who has argued that the circle of liberal arts came into being in Neoplatonic circles and was then transmitted to the Medieval West through Augustine's works. To prove this, Hadot greatly underplayed the role of Varro's *Disciplines*, claiming that "we know almost nothing about its content and order" and that "we do not know whether some of the books were devoted to mathematical sciences – if at all".¹⁸ In a more recent article, Hadot claims: "Les sources littéraires et épigraphiques relatives à l'enseignement habituel ou ordinaire dans les gymnases hellénistiques et les écoles privées ne parlent jamais d'un enseignement régulier en sciences mathématiques".¹⁹ She holds the same view on mathematical education in the Imperial period. Within this dispute, I would like to take the middle ground. While the scarcity of Greek evidence does not allow for far-reaching conclusions, we are already in Varro – who was undoubtedly well acquainted with and made extensive use of Greek sources – faced with clear and convincing evidence contradicting Hadot's conclusions.

The goals of this paper are therefore (1) to defend the tradition positing that Varro's *Disciplines* did include four books devoted to the subjects of quadrivium; (2) to provide a description of its content, composition, and sources; and (3) to attempt an account of mathematical education in Varro's time.

Literary evidence suggests that in some circles of Roman society, there was a certain, though modest, demand for mathematical education. For those in the higher circles of society, there was a constant pressure to be (or seem) sufficiently educated, and μαθήματα were among the subjects one needed to be familiar with. Varro's *Disciplines* was probably an entry-level book that provided the reader with useful and concise information about all the subjects considered necessary for a noble and well-educated person.

¹⁴ Stahl 1971.

¹⁵ Barney et al. 2006.

¹⁶ Ritschl 1877, 352–402.

¹⁷ Dahlmann 1935, 1255; Fuchs 1962, 387; Kühnert 1961, 58 ff.; Simon 1966, 94.

¹⁸ Hadot 1984, 156; 168.

¹⁹ Hadot 1998, 233–250.

Most of our evidence comes from Cicero, according to whom some people preferred to spend their free time indulging in geometry (*De orat.* 3. 58). These include a Roman general, Sextus Pompeius, who was quite successful in his studies of geometry (*Brutus* 175 and *De off.* 1. 19), and the poet and politician Cornelius Gallus, who devoted himself *studio dimetiendi paene caeli atque terrae* (*De sen.* 49). A Stoic philosopher, Diodotus, spent many years living under Cicero's roof. Despite being blind, Diodotus continued teaching geometry: *quod sine oculis fieri posse vix videtur, geometriae munus tuebatur verbis praecipiens discipulis, unde quo quamque lineam scriberent* (*Tusc.* 5. 113). Cicero himself was his student in dialectics but also in "many other things" (*Brutus* 309). Cicero's interest in astronomy is well-known; he even translated Aratus's poem *Phaenomena*. Furthermore, Suetonius writes that Vergil *maxime mathematicae operam dedit* (*Vit. Verg.* 15), while Caesar gave Roman citizenship to *liberalium atrium doctores, quo libentius et ipsi urbem incolerent et ceteri adpeterent* (*Caes.* 1. 42. 1). Plutarch mentions that Pompeius's wife was well-versed in geometry (*Pomp.* 55). In the first century AD, Columella, lamenting the terrible state of agricultural education, mentions that people are extremely careful in choosing their teachers in a number of different disciplines – including geometry – and that there even exist *scholae geometrarum* (1. *Praef.* 5). In fact, schools owned by private teachers must have existed even earlier: the aforementioned Diodotus had what was essentially a *schola*.²⁰ Quintilian insisted that *nullo modo sine geometria esse possit orator* (*Inst.* 1. 49).

The evidence for studying geometry and other mathematical sciences as a part of higher education in Varro's time is far from abundant, but we still can conclude that some people who did not in the slightest aspire to become professional mathematicians, architects, and so on, did indeed have some experience in studying the μαθήματα.

Though authors mentioning Varro in relation to the μαθήματα are not numerous, the evidence certainly appears direct and clear in support of Varro's involvement in the μαθήματα:

1) Pliny draws a lot of his geographical evidence (especially, measurements) from Varro (*NH* 3. 45, 95, 109; 4. 77–78, 115–116).

2) From Aulus Gellius we know that Varro made some observations about a certain *ratio geometrica* in one of the books of the *Disciplines* (*NA* 18. 15), wrote about different parts of geometry (16. 18), and provided geometrical definitions (1. 20).

²⁰ On Roman *scholae*, see Bonner 1977.

3) Augustine's friend Licentius of Tagaste in his *Carmen ad Augustinum* portrays himself toiling over Varro's books – *perplexa viri compendia tanti* (5). In the following lines, he makes references to the studies of music (7–8), geometry (11–12), and astronomy (13–14).²¹

4) Cassiodorus attests to the existence of both *volumen geometriae* (*Inst.* 2. 7. 4) and *liber de astrologia* (*ib.* 2). Moreover, Varro is one of the sources for Cassiodorus's book on music (*ib.* 5. 8). Varro's views on the origin of geometry are also reported by Cassiodorus (*ib.* 6. 1).

5) Martianus Capella refers to Varro several times: in his geometry book in *De nuptiis*, he says that geometry crossed the thresholds of very few Romans, among them Varro (6. 578); Capella then mentions the latter in two geographical measurements (6. 639, 662), in his books on astronomy (8. 817) and music (9. 928). Even more numerous are his allusions to Varro.²²

6) Claudianus Mamertus is familiar with Varro's books on music and geometry (*De statu animae* 2. 8).

Thus, our evidence comes from a number of authors and explicitly indicates not only the mere existence of books on different mathematical subjects, but in the case of geometry – where the evidence is most ample – it also outlines the book's content, as we will see later.

Geometry: its origin and connection to astronomy

Let us start with Varro's views on the origin of geometry and how they relate to the ancient tradition. To do so, we are going to examine a text that exists in four versions. The earliest surviving version is found in *Institutiones* by Cassiodorus (approximately mid-530s or later),²³ while the other three are Isidorus's *Etymologiae*, written between 615 and 632, Pseudo-Boethius's *Demonstratio artis geometriae* (not later than the eighth century),²⁴ and an anonymous treatise titled *De septem artibus liberalibus* from the eighth century.²⁵ Of these, Cassiodorus's provides the fullest account, and after Lachmann's edition of Pseudo-Boethius, it was long believed that the latter's text depended directly on Cassiodorus. Schindel, however, demonstrated that all texts including the last treatise, which he

²¹ For a critical text accompanied by an insightful commentary, see Shanzer 1991, 110–143.

²² See index to Stahl 1971, s.v. *Varro*.

²³ Halporn–Vessey 2004, 23–24.

²⁴ Lachmann 1848, 393–406.

²⁵ Schindel 2004, 132–144.

was the first to publish, go back to a common source which Schindel dates ca. 500 CE.²⁶ Quite tellingly, all of our sources are encyclopedic and were written with educational purposes in mind. Cass. *Inst.* 2. 6. 1:

Geometria latine dicitur terrae dimensio, quoniam per diversas formas ipsius disciplinae, ut nonnulli dicunt, primum Aegyptus dominis propriis fertur esse partitus; cuius disciplinae magistri mensores ante dicebantur. sed Varro, peritissimus Latinorum, huius nominis causam sic exitissime commemorat, dicens prius quidem dimensiones terrarum terminis positus vagantibus ac discordantibus populis pacis utilia praestitisse; deinde totius anni circulum menstruali numero fuisse partitum, unde et ipsi menses, quod annum metiantur, edicti sunt. verum postquam ista reperta sunt, provocati studiosi ad illa invisibilia cognoscenda coeperunt quaerere quanto spatio a terra luna, a luna sol ipse distaret, et usque ad verticem caeli quanta se mensura distenderet; quod peritissimos geometras assecutos esse commemorat. tunc et dimensionem universae terrae probabiliter refert ratione collectam; ideoque factum est ut disciplina ipsa Geometria nomen acciperet, quod per saecula longa custodit.

Geometry in Latin means the measurement of the earth; some say it is so named because Egypt was first divided among its own lords by various forms of this discipline. In earlier times the teachers of this discipline were called measurers. But Varro, the most learned of the Latin writers, offers the following reason for the name. First the measurement of the earth gave useful peace to wandering peoples [who disagreed] by setting down boundary stones. Then the circle of the whole year was apportioned out by the measurement of the months. As a result, the months themselves were so named because they measure the years. But after these things were discovered, scholars were moved to study intangible phenomena, and began to ask how far the moon was from the earth and the sun from the moon and how far it was to the top of the heavens. He reports that the most learned geometricians arrived at the measurements of these distances. Then he also relates that the measurement of the whole earth was arrived at by a praiseworthy reasoning; thus it came about that the discipline received the name geometry [of geometry] that it bears over the course of the ages.²⁷

Cassiodorus starts his account with a reference to a well-known Greek tradition tracing the invention of geometry to Egypt. According to this tradition, which makes its first appearance in Herodotus, the need

²⁶ Schindel 2006, 99–108.

²⁷ Tr. W. Halporn (Halporn–Vessey 2004, 223).

for the first land surveyors was born due to the annual inundation of the Nile, by which the land was diminished, so the amount of taxes had to be adjusted according to the new land size (2. 109). Aristotle also believes that the exact sciences are of Egyptian origin, but initially related neither to pleasure nor to utility as in Democritus (*Met.* 981 b):²⁸

When all discoveries of this kind (i. e. aimed at utility or pleasure) were fully developed, the sciences which relate neither to pleasure nor yet to the necessities of life were invented, and first in those places where men had leisure. Thus, the mathematical sciences originated in the neighborhood of Egypt, because there the priestly class was allowed leisure.

His student Eudemus of Rhodes considered geometry an Egyptian invention that appeared for the practical purposes of land surveying (Procl. *In Eucl.* 64. 16 = fr. 133 W.).

Varro's view on the matter is quite different. Egypt is not even mentioned in his account; instead, he highlights the role that land-measuring played in the making of human civilization: at first there were some wandering and quarreling tribes (*populi vagantes ac discordantes*) who made peace due to land surveying. It follows that the same invention put an end to their nomadic lifestyle as well and hence *populi vagantes* became settled, although this is not mentioned in the fragment. Before Varro, a similar pacifying role was ascribed by Archytas to arithmetic (47 B 3 DK): the invention of counting put an end to discord (στάσις) and increased concord (ὁμόνοια). Both Varro and Archytas see the inventions' utility (*utilitas*, χρήσιμον) in these social consequences. Moreover, according to Varro, the beginnings of all arts first appeared because of some utility (just as in Democritus): *Scire autem debemus, sicut Varro dicit, utilitatis alicuius causa omnium artium exitisse principia* (Cass. *Inst.* 528).

Having established the origin of geometry, Varro proceeds to how it was used afterwards. According to him, its next contribution was to the calendar, when the year was divided into months: *deinde totius anni circulum menstruali numero fuisse partitum, unde et ipsi menses, quod annum metiantur, edicti sunt*. The fact that Varro assigns geometry responsibility for calendars is quite unusual. Normally, calendars were perceived as a part of astronomy, as they result from the observation

²⁸ Tr. Tredennick 1933, 9. For Democritus and his influence on later tradition v. Cole 1967.

of celestial bodies and their movements. This will not be the last time Varro's geometry appears instead of other sciences.

It is known that Varro himself was interested in calendars: in his *Res rusticae*, he describes the beginning and the duration of each season and gives instructions as to when certain agricultural works have to be executed (1. 28–36). Traditionally, the year's division into months has also been ascribed to Egyptians: Herodotus says that “the Egyptians were the first men who reckoned by years and made the year consist of twelve divisions of the seasons. <...> the Egyptians, reckoning thirty days to each of the twelve months, add five days in every year over and above the total” (2. 4. 1).²⁹ Herodotus's belief in the Egyptian provenance of geometry and year division became a recurring *topos* in ancient thought.³⁰

Interestingly, Varro ascribes these two incredibly important inventions to neither a nation (e.g. Egyptians) nor an individual ingenious inventor (the so-called *πρῶτος εὐρητής*) – nor to philosophy, as his older contemporary Posidonius did (*Sen. Ep.* XC = F 284 E–K). Instead, Varro's views seem to represent an evolution of the tradition that the origin of arts and sciences lies in necessity. Contrary to an almost unanimous opinion that geometry originated in Egypt, Varro traces its invention back to the dawn of human civilization.

In the next sentences, Varro refers to some famous astronomical discoveries that were made through the application of geometry (*provocati studiosi ad illa invisibilia* etc.). Thus, he calls people who made them ‘geometers’. Several Hellenistic scientists are known to have dealt with measurements of distances between the Earth and other celestial bodies. The first scientific attempt was made by Aristarchus of Samos, who claimed that the distance between the Earth and the Sun was about 18 to 20 times bigger than the distance between the Earth and the Moon (*De magn.*). Archimedes and Hipparchus were also interested in the same question. The Earth's circumference (*dimensio universae terrae*) was first calculated by Eratosthenes in his book *Περὶ ἀναμετρήσεως τῆς γῆς*, while Posidonius studied both matters too (Cleomedes 1. 10). Even though Cassiodorus does not give any names, there is still a reason to suggest that Varro did: Cassiodorus's remark “*quod peritissimos geometras assecutos esse commemorat (sc. Varro)*” might mean just that. Hence,

²⁹ Tr. Godley 1920, 279.

³⁰ On the Egyptian provenance of geometry cf. Diod. 1. 69. 5; 81. 3; 94. 3; Strabo 17. 1. 3 (C 788); on Egyptians discovering the year cf. Diod. 1. 50. 1–2; Strabo 17. 1. 29 (C 806); 1. 46 (C 816).

the names must have been left out by an intermediary source. As to why Varro does not draw a distinction between geometers and astronomers, the answer might be that he underlines the primacy of geometry in regard to astronomy, as the latter heavily relies on geometrical principles. Varro might have used geometry as an umbrella term for mathematics.³¹

It appears, then, that we deal with an extremely curtailed version of what used to be a historical introduction to the book of geometry. Is it possible to amplify evidence provided by Cassiodorus, using later sources? Isidorus's summary (*Etym.* 3. 10) is quite brief, but still yields some additional information (in bold):

Geometriae disciplina primum ab Aegyptiis reperta dicitur, quod, inundante Nilo et omnium possessionibus limo obductis, initium terrae dividendae per lineas et mensuras nomen arti dedit. **Quae deinde longius acumine sapientium profecta et maris et caeli et aeris spatia metuntur.** Nam provocati studio sic coeperunt **post terrae dimensionem** et caeli spatia quaerere: quanto intervallo luna a terris, a luna sol ipse distaret, et usque ad verticem caeli quanta se mensura distenderet, sicque **intervalla ipsa caeli orbisque ambitum** per numerum stadiorum ratione probabili distinxerunt. Sed quia ex terrae dimensione haec disciplina coepit, ex initio sui et nomen servavit. Nam geometria de terra et de mensura nuncupata est. Terra enim Graece GE vocatur, METRA mensura. Huius disciplinae ars continet in se lineamenta, intervalla, magnitudines et figuras, et in figuris dimensiones et numeros.

It is said that the discipline of geometry was first discovered by the Egyptians, because, when the Nile River flooded and everyone's possessions were covered with mud, the onset of dividing the earth by means of lines and measures gave a name to the skill. **And thereupon, when it was greatly perfected by the acumen of wise men, the expanses of the sea, sky, and air were measured.** Stimulated by their zeal, these sages began, **after they had measured the land**, to inquire about the region of the sky, as to how far the moon is from the earth, and even the sun from the moon; and how great a distance there is to the pinnacle of the heavens. And so, using reasoning capable of being tested and proved, they determined **the distances of the vault of heaven and**

³¹ Quintilian, in the first book of *Institutio oratoria*, points out that geometry might be useful for an orator in settling land disputes, but also in understanding certain astronomical matters. According to Quintilian, "*quid quod se eadem geometria tollit ad rationem usque mundi? in qua, cum siderum certos constitutosque cursus numeris docet, discimus nihil esse inordinatum atque fortuitum; quod ipsum nonnunquam pertinere ad oratorem potest?*" (1. 10. 46). Another example of a similar approach is found in Cass. *Variae*, 3. 52: (*Geometria*), *quae tantum de caelestibus disputat.*

the perimeter of the earth in terms of the number of stadia. But because the discipline began with measuring the earth, it retained its name from its origin, for geometry (*geometria*) takes its name from “earth” and “measure.” In Greek, “earth” is called GE and “measure” is METRA. The art of this discipline is concerned with lines, distances, sizes and shapes, and the dimensions and numbers found in shapes.³²

As we see, Varro's rather untraditional account of the origin of geometry is completely left out here, which probably explains why a reference to him is missing. Still, the new sentence (*quae deinde longius* etc.) helps us to connect the dots from such simple things as land measurements and the division of the year into twelve months on the one hand to quite advanced astronomical measurements on the other. Isidorus makes it clear that at first the Greeks succeeded in the realm of visible objects by measuring the *maris et caeli et aëris spatia*, which inspired them to turn their attention to the *invisibilia*. Thus, the questions that we have to ask ourselves are the following: what are the distances that are being referred to, and is there any evidence related to them that we can trace back to Varro? When it comes to *spatia maris*, in Martianus Capella's book on geometry there is indeed some evidence that connects Varro with sea measurements (*De nuptiis* 6. 662):

circuitus vero totius Ponti vicies semel quinquaginta milibus, ut Varro quoque non reticet, qui adicit Europae totius longitudinem habere sexagies ter triginta septem milia passusque quingentos.

Moreover, geography seems to have occupied quite a significant place in Varro's book.³³ Both Pliny (3. 45, 95, 109; 4. 77–78, 115–116) and Martianus Capella (6. 662, 639) mention Varro as their source for various geographical measurements.

³² Tr. Barney et al. 2006, 93.

³³ Cf. Strabo (based probably on Posidonius): “Those who write on the science of Geography should trust entirely for the arrangement of the subject they are engaged on to the geometers, who have measured the whole earth; they in their turn to astronomers; and these again to natural philosophers. Now natural philosophy is one of the perfect sciences. <...> Admitting these points in whole or in part, astronomers proceed to treat of other matters, [such as] the motions [of the stars], their revolutions, eclipses, size, relative distance, and a thousand similar particulars. On their side, geometers, when measuring the size of the entire earth, avail themselves of the data furnished by the natural philosopher and astronomer; and the geographer on his part makes use of those of the geometer” (Geogr. 2. 5. 2; tr. Hamilton–Falconer 1853, 166–167). In Varro's hierarchy, as opposed to this one, natural philosophy does not seem to claim primacy over sciences.

Spatia caeli et aëris, however, present some problems: first of all, at first glance, *spatia caeli* seem to be out of place here, as in the next sentence we have *coeperunt post terrae dimensionem et caeli spatia quaerere: quanto intervallo luna a terris* etc.: so, *spatia caeli* are astronomical measurements that were carried out by scientists after they measured *terrae dimensionem*. Secondly, what are *spatia aëris*?

I suggest considering an example of what could have been described as *spatia aëris*. Varro's older contemporary Posidonius "supposes that there is a space of not less than 40 stadia around the earth, whence mists, winds, and clouds (*nubila ac venti nubesque*) proceed".³⁴ So, there might be no need to get rid of the first *spatia caeli* in *spatia caeli et aëris*: one could understand them together as the distances between the earth, clouds, and air that were measured before scientists ventured even further to measure celestial distances.

The ascent from the visible to the invisible might have been a part of the same tradition that Varro used, which described the emergence of sciences due to necessity and their gradual evolution from the practical to the more and more abstract.³⁵ This ascent has been interpreted by some³⁶ as purely philosophical (leading some scholars even further to conclude that there was a book on philosophy in the *Disciplinarum libri* instead of one on astronomy).³⁷ That is simply not the case: the existence of his astronomy book is attested to by different sources³⁸ (while that of a book on philosophy is not) and both the *visibilia* and *invisibilia* in his account are strictly scientific. *Spatio maris* and *dimensio terrae* are named among the achievements of geometers in the realm of *visibilia* – while such unmistakably astronomical questions as *quanto intervallo luna a terris, a luna sol ipse distaret, et usque ad verticem caeli quanta*

³⁴ Plin. *NH* 2. 21. Further he writes: "Beyond this, he supposes that the air (*aëra*) is pure and liquid, consisting of uninterrupted light; from the clouded region to the moon there is a space of 2 000 000 of stadia, and thence to the sun of 500 000 000. It is in consequence of this space that the sun, notwithstanding his immense magnitude, does not burn the earth. Many persons have imagined that the clouds rise to the height of 900 stadia" (tr. Bostock–Riley 1855, 53–54). There had been a vivid discussion of the cloud belt since Aristotle (*Meteor.* 340 a–b). See F 120 E–K.

³⁵ Cf. Pizzani 1976, 460.

³⁶ Fuchs 1926, 158 n. 1, followed by Dahlmann 1935, 1258, suggested that in the distribution of material, Varro followed a spiritual itinerary from corporeal to incorporeal similar to the one in Augustine.

³⁷ Della Corte 1954, 239, 247–253; Solignac 1958, 122–123; Pizzani 1974, 672–675.

³⁸ V. the introduction to this article.

se mensura distenderet, were, according to Varro, also answered by *geometrae*. In fact, the 'visible to invisible' ascent does not have to always be Neoplatonic in origin. Here, it might be a part of a scientific method used in exact sciences, where the visible serves as a starting point for the cognition of the invisible.³⁹

Thus, the Geometry book of Varro's *Disciplines* must have started with a historical account of the birth of geometry as the art of land-surveying, in which Varro (or his source) offers quite a unique perspective on the origin of geometry and the role it played in the history of humankind. It would have been followed by a list of scientists and their geographical and astronomical discoveries. It is reasonable to suppose that introductions to other books of *Disciplinae* followed the same structure: the invention of a discipline due to a certain utility and a list of scientists and their discoveries. Thus, arithmetic might have been invented because it is useful in trade (as stated in Eudemos), astronomy because it made navigation easier, and music because it – since the time of Pythagoras – was thought to have a calming effect on people and animals (Cass. *Inst.* 2. 5. 8):

Unde claret quoniam hyperlydius tonus omnium acutissimus septem tonis praecedit hypodorium omnium gravissimum. In quibus, ut Varro meminit, tantae utilitatis virtus ostensa est ut excitatos animos sedarent, ipsas quoque bestias, necnon et serpentes, volucres atque delfinas ad auditum suae modulationis attraherent.

Augustine's *De ordine* (2. 12. 35) seems to contain traces of a similarly structured introduction to Varro's book of grammar from the *Disciplines*: *quibus duobus repertis* (sc. *litteris et numeratione*) *nata est illa librariorum et calculonum professio velut quaedam grammaticae infantia, quam Varro litterationem vocat*. Here, a discipline again comes into being because of some utility and quickly becomes a specialized field of knowledge with people choosing it as their profession; then, it becomes more and more abstract and detached from day-to-day issues.

³⁹ On this method, that O. Regenbogen called "eine Methode naturwissenschaftlicher Hypothesenbildung durch Analogieschlüsse", see Regenbogen 1930, 131 ff. and Diller 1932, 14–42.

Varro's definitions and Euclid (Gell. *NA* 1. 20)

Aulus Gellius turns to geometry thrice: in the first book of *Noctes Atticae* (1. 20), he offers some geometrical definitions (on which we are going to focus in this section); in the following books he discusses various parts of geometry (16. 18), and notes the relation between a certain poetic meter and a geometric ratio (18. 15). Given that in all three places Gellius mentions Varro as his source, it is safe to say that Varro was his only source on geometry.

Now, to how Aulus Gellius himself viewed the audience he was writing for and what sources he used for his writing, as these directly affect how sophisticated the book's content will prove: in the *Prooemium* to his *Noctes Atticae*, Gellius compares himself to the authors of the same genre, finding that many authors, especially of Greek origin, "swept together whatever they had found, aiming at mere quantity. The perusal of such collections will exhaust the mind through weariness or disgust".⁴⁰ Gellius, on the contrary,

took few items from them, confining myself to those which, by furnishing a quick and easy short-cut, might lead active and alert minds to a desire for independent learning and to the study of the useful arts, or would save those who are already fully occupied with the other duties of life from an ignorance of words and things which is assuredly shameful and boorish (*Pr.* 12).

He makes a special reference to some "obscure" subjects, geometry included:

Now just because there will be found in these notes some few topics that are knotty and troublesome, either from Grammar or Dialectics or even from Geometry, and because there will also be some little material of a somewhat recondite character about augural or pontifical law, one ought not therefore to avoid such topics as useless to know or difficult to comprehend. For I have not made an excessively deep and obscure investigation of the intricacies of these questions, but I have presented the first fruits, so to say, and a kind of foretaste of the liberal arts; and never to have heard of these, or come in contact with them, is at least unbecoming, if not positively harmful, for a man with even an ordinary education (*Pr.* 13).

⁴⁰ Tr. Rolfe 1927 here and for all later quotations from *Noctes Atticae*.

Now we know what to expect from Gellius's notes on geometry: they are supposed to be entry-level, i.e. not difficult to comprehend, but at the same time useful, as not knowing such things is shameful for an educated person. The fact that Gellius had to warn his readers about some "knotty and troublesome topics" pertaining to the fields of grammar, dialectics, and geometry shows exactly the kind of reputation these subjects had: knotty, troublesome, and obscure. Gellius did not go as far as explaining all the intricacies of the aforementioned disciplines, but instead saw himself "pointing out of the path [that] they [i.e. the readers] may afterwards follow up [on] those subjects, if they so desire, with the aid either of books or of teachers" (*Pr.* 17).

Now, let us take a closer look at the geometrical definitions from the first book of *Noctes Atticae*:

On what the geometers call ἐπίπεδος, στερεός, κύβος and γραμμή, with the Latin equivalents for all these terms of the figures which the geometers call σχήματα there are two kinds, 'plane' and 'solid'. These the Greeks themselves call respectively ἐπίπεδος and στερεός. A 'plane' figure is one that has all its lines in two dimensions only, breadth and length; for example, triangles and squares, which are drawn on a flat surface without height. We have a 'solid' figure, when its several lines do not produce merely length and breadth in a plane, but are raised so as to produce height also; such are in general the triangular columns which they call 'pyramids', or those which are bounded on all sides by squares, such as the Greeks call κύβοι, and we *quadrantalia*. For the κύβος is a figure which is square on all its sides, "like the dice", says Marcus Varro, "with which we play on a gaming-board, for which reason the dice themselves are called κύβοι". Similarly, in numbers too the term κύβος is used, when every factor consisting of the same number is equally resolved into the cube number itself, as is the case when three is taken three times and the resulting number itself is then trebled. Pythagoras declared that the cube of the number three controls the course of the moon, since the moon passes through its orbit in twenty-seven days, and the *ternio*, or 'triad', which the Greeks call τριάς, when cubed makes twenty-seven. Furthermore, our geometers apply the term *linea*, or 'line', to what the Greeks call γραμμή. This is defined by Marcus Varro as follows: "A line", says he, "is length without breadth or height". But Euclid says more tersely, omitting "height": "A line is μήκος ἀπλατές, or 'breadthless length'". ἀπλατές cannot be expressed in Latin by a single word, unless you should venture to coin the term *inlatabile*.

Ritschl suggested that Gellius took from Varro not only the two definitions in which Varro is explicitly mentioned (i.e. cube and line), but

the whole paragraph.⁴¹ This is highly probable, given that Varro seems to have been his only source on geometry.

The first thing that immediately catches the eye is the structure of this fragment and its logic (or sometimes lack thereof): the first two definitions (of plane and solid figures) already make use of a term ‘line’, which should have been explained earlier, but instead makes its appearance only at the end of the passage. Still, we are going to look into these definitions in the order in which Aulus Gellius placed them.

a) Plane and Solid Figures

Figurarum, quae σχήματα geometrae appellant, genera sunt duo, ‘planum’ et ‘solidum’. Haec ipsi vocant ἐπίπεδον καὶ στερεόν. ‘Planum’ est, quod in duas partis solum lineas habet, qua latum est et qua longum: qualia sunt triquetra et quadrata, quae in area fiunt, sine altitudine. ‘Solidum’ est, quando non longitudines modo et latitudines planas numeri linearum efficiunt, sed etiam extollunt altitudines quales sunt ferme metae triangulae, quas ‘pyramidas’ appellant, vel qualia sunt quadrata undique, quae κύβους illi, nos *quadrantalia* dicimus.

The definition of a plane figure conveys the meaning of Euclid’s definition,⁴² but does so in a less abstract way: the definition creates visual images of drawn geometrical figures (*in area fiunt*), while the examples of triangles and squares should facilitate understandings of the term. The definition of a solid figure follows the same pattern as that of a plane figure, including the use of examples (cf. Euclid: στερεόν ἐστὶ τὸ μήκος καὶ πλάτος καὶ βάθος ἔχον; *Def.* 11. 1).

b) Cube

<...> vel qualia sunt quadrata undique, quae κύβους illi, nos *quadrantalia* dicimus. Κύβος enim est figura ex omni latere quadrata, “quales sunt”, inquit M. Varro, “tesseræ, quibus in alveolo luditur, ex quo ipsae quoque appellatae κύβοι”. In numeris etiam similiter κύβος dicitur, cum omne latus eiusdem numeri aequabiliter in sese solvitur, sicuti fit, cum ter terna ducuntur atque ipse numerus triplicatur. Huius numeri cubum Pythagoras vim habere lunaris circuli dixit, quod et luna orbem suum lustret septem et viginti diebus et numerus ternio, qui τριάς Graece dicitur, tantundem efficiat in cubo.

⁴¹ Ritschl 1877, 386.

⁴² ἐπίπεδος ἐπιφανεία ἐστὶν ἢ τις ἐξ ἴσου ταῖς ἐφ’ ἑαυτῆς εὐθείαις κείται (*Def.* 1. 7).

The term *quadrantal* is quite interesting. Gellius says that what Greeks call κύβος, Romans call *quadrantal*, but in fact the Latin term in its geometrical meaning occurs only here. Usually, this term is used for volume units.⁴³ In a couple of later authors, this word is also documented in its arithmetical meaning, i.e. arithmetical cube.⁴⁴ What are we to make of this? Seeing that Gellius's only geometrical source was Varro, and Varro himself was one of the first Romans to write on the subject of geometry in Latin, it might well be that it was Varro who "reinvented" the term *quadrantal* that was previously applied only to volume units. Still, the term did not quite catch on, and the Greek *cybus/cubus* became the standard terms.

According to Varro, "the κύβος is a figure which is square on all its sides". A quick comparison to Euclid's definition (κύβος ἐστὶ σχῆμα στερεὸν ὑπὸ ἑξ τετραγώνων ἴσων περιεχόμενον: *Def.* 11. 25) shows that the Varro's one is quite imprecise: it fails to mention the number of squares that are needed to make a cube, as well as the fact that all the squares have to be equal.

The geometrical definition of a cube is followed by an arithmetical one, i.e. "in numbers too the term κύβος is used, when every factor consisting of the same number is equally resolved into the cube number itself". The definition is accompanied by an example of three cubed (cf. *Euc. Def.* 7. 20: Κύβος δὲ ὁ ἰσάκις ἴσος ἰσάκις ἢ [ὁ] ὑπὸ τριῶν ἴσων ἀριθμῶν περιεχόμενος).

The following sentence turns to arithmology, invoking the authority of Pythagoras: "Pythagoras declared that the cube of the number three controls the course of the moon, since the moon passes through its orbit in twenty-seven days, and the ternio, or 'triad', which the Greeks call τριάς, when cubed makes twenty-seven". Considering Varro's interest in arithmology, this passage is hardly surprising. Varro took a great interest in Neopythagoreanism and authored such arithmological treatises as *De principiis numerorum* and *Hebdomades*. His other works are replete with arithmological references,⁴⁵ at least some of which he must have taken from *Anonymus Arithmologicus* – a pseudo-Pythagorean treatise, which Frank Robbins dated to the late second or early first century BCE.⁴⁶ It is difficult – if at all possible – to trace Varro's source for the definition in question, but it certainly was influenced by the Neopythagorean movement and contained a lot of arithmological material.

⁴³ Cato, *Fest.* 258. 20; id. *RR* 57. 2; Plaut. *Curc.* 1. 2. 15; Plin. *NH* 14. 14. 16.

⁴⁴ Cass. *In Psalm.* 8. 275; Fav. *Eul.* 15. 2, 6; *TLL* s.v. *cubus*.

⁴⁵ See Palmer 1970, 5–34.

⁴⁶ Robbins 1920, 309–322.

c) Line

‘Linea’ autem a nostris dicitur, quam γραμμὴν Graeci nominant. Eam M. Varro ita definit: “Linea est”, inquit, “longitudo quaedam sine latitudine et altitudine”. Εὐκλείδης autem brevius praetermissa altitudine: “γραμμή”, inquit, “est μήκος ἀπλατέζ”, quod exprimere uno Latine verbo non queas, nisi audeas dicere ‘inlatabile’.

Varro defines line as “some length without breadth or height”. The comparison to Euclid’s definition follows, with Varro noting that Euclid omits “height”, saying “γραμμὴ μήκος ἀπλατέζ” (= *Euc. Def.* 1. 2). Was it Varro (or Varro’s source), or was it Gellius himself to draw this comparison? Based on the nature of Varro’s suggested source (or sources), it most likely contained the reference to Euclid in the first place.

It is quite obvious that Varro’s definition builds upon that of Euclid, expanding upon the latter by adding height. Very few line definitions take height into account, with only Hero (*Def.* 2. 1), Proclus (*In Eucl.* 97. 2–3),⁴⁷ and Macrobius (*Somn.* 2. 2. 5) doing so in addition to Varro.

Hero’s *Definitiones*⁴⁸ belong to a vast body of works that can be described as an “Introduction to the Elements”. The need for this type of treatise arises when knowledge of the basics of arithmetic and geometry becomes a *sine qua non* not only for people in the fields directly connected to the exact sciences (i. e. architecture and land surveying), but also for well-educated people in general. Consequently, such introductions were needed and used in education (e. g. in books by Pappus and Proclus).

In the *Prooemium*, Hero promises to his addressee Dionysius “a sketch of the technical terms premised in the elements of geometry”.⁴⁹ His whole arrangement is based “upon the teaching of Euclid, the writer of the elements of theoretical geometry”. Hero aims to give his reader “a good general understanding not only of Euclid’s works, but of many others pertaining to geometry”. To these ends, Hero provides each term with a number of definitions to accommodate for a deeper understanding of the subject matter. Hero’s treatment of the term ‘line’ is a good example of this approach (*Def.* 2):

⁴⁷ This definition might go down to Geminus (see Tittel 1895, 20).

⁴⁸ Hero’s authorship of *Definitiones* was put into question by Knorr, who argues that this work is due to Diophantus (Knorr 1993, 180–192). V. contra: Giardina 2003, 83–85. Cuomo attributes *Definitiones* to Hero, at the same time acknowledging that the treatise might be due to Diophantus and that the question of authorship may ultimately remain unsolved (Cuomo 2001, 161, 163).

⁴⁹ Tr. Thomas 1957, 467.

Line is length without breadth and without depth or what first takes existence in magnitude or what has one dimension and is divisible as well; it originates when a point flows from up downwards according to the notion of continuum, and is surrounded and limited by points, itself being the limit of a surface. One can say that a line is what divides the sunlight from the shadow or the shadow from the lighted part and in a toga imagined as a continuum <it divides> the purple line from the wool or the wool from the purple. Already in customary language we have an idea of the line as having only length, but neither breadth nor depth. We say then: a wall is according to hypothesis 100 cubits, without considering the breadth or the thickness, or a road is 50 stades, only the length, without also concerning ourselves with its breadth, so that the calculation of that as well is for us linear; it is in fact also called linear measurement.⁵⁰

Hero lived in the first century CE, and he most certainly could not be Varro's source; still, his *Definitiones* are a representative example of a tradition far preceding both his own time and that of Varro. Thus, using his *Definitiones* as an example, we now have a clearer picture of what sources Varro might have used in putting together the books on the *quadrivium*: among his sources, there definitely were some Hellenistic introductions to μαθήματα. These introductions were meant to elucidate the concepts succinctly defined in Euclid, but some of them were likely not limited to Euclid: traces of the post-Euclidean tradition are found in Hero and Geminus,⁵¹ while some mathematical extracts from the commentary to *Theaetetus* do not follow Euclid.⁵²

Parts of geometry

Book sixteen of *Noctes Atticae* contains yet another fragment on geometry, this time with Varro's notes on the state of Roman education in exact sciences.

a) Optics

Pars quaedam geometriae ὀπτική appellatur, quae ad oculos pertinet, pars altera, quae ad auris, κανονική vocatur, qua musici ut fundamento artis suae utuntur. Utraque harum spatiis et intervallis linearum et ratione numerorum constat.

⁵⁰ For commentary, see Giardina 2003, 265–270.

⁵¹ Tittel 1912, 1049–1050.

⁵² Cuomo 2001, 143–145.

Ὀπτική facit multa demiranda id genus, ut in speculo uno imagines unius rei plures appareant; item ut speculum in loco certo positum nihil imaginet, aliorum translatum faciat imagines; item si rectus speculum spectes, imago fiat tua eiusmodi, ut caput deorsum videatur, pedes sursum. Reddit etiam causas ea disciplina, cur istae quoque visiones fallant, ut quae in aqua conspiciuntur, maiora ad oculos fiant, quae procul ab oculis sunt, minora (Gell. *NA* 16. 18).

A part of geometry which relates to the sight is called optics, another part, relating to the ears, is known as canonic, which musicians make use of as the foundation of their art. Both of these rely on the spaces and the intervals between lines and on number ratios.

Optics affect many surprising things, such as the appearance in one mirror of several images of the same thing; also that a mirror placed in a certain position shows no image, but when moved to another spot gives reflections; also that if you look straight into a mirror, your reflection is such that your head appears below and your feet uppermost. This science also gives the reasons for optical illusions, such as the magnifying of objects seen in the water, and the small size of those that are remote from the eye.⁵³

Ancient optics is a mathematical visual ray theory. Aristotle includes optics among the “more physical” of the mathematical sciences (*Ph.* 2. 2. 194 a 7–12), along with harmonics and astronomy. Since Aristotle, optics had been considered a science subordinate to geometry. It aimed to explain visual perceptions of space, perspective, and visual illusions. Catoptrics, i. e. the study of reflection and refraction, was built upon the same geometrical laws as optics, but it quite early became an independent discipline (probably with Euclid).⁵⁴

In our text, optics is defined as a part of geometry relating to the eyes which builds upon spaces and intervals between lines and number ratios. Note that in our text, optics is a part of geometry, not a subordinate science. The next paragraph exemplifies how optics is used. The majority of examples are not optics proper, but rather catoptrics. Mirror images are followed by an example of refraction (the magnification of objects seen in water) and one optical example of perspective that is very basic in nature: remote objects appear small. Thus, the source must have covered all varieties of ancient optics and catoptrics (mirror images and illusions, refraction, perspective), but the nature of the original treatise is hard to

⁵³ Tr. Rolfe 1927, 187, 189, with modifications.

⁵⁴ Lejeune 1957, 180.

identify: was it a scientific treatise or an educational one? One thing has to be noted though: in the text, optics is based solely on mathematics, and physical (i. e. pertaining to natural philosophy) ἀρχαί are not mentioned – meaning that optics, in addition to geometry, is independent from natural philosophy.⁵⁵

The outline of optics in our text is pretty simplistic. It does not cover even the basics of the science: spaces and intervals between the lines are referred to, while the visual cone itself, on which the very principles of optics are based, is left out. It is unclear which one of the three ancient physical vision theories was adopted here.⁵⁶ Instead, the text concentrates on curious cases – *multa demiranda* – that are probably meant to provoke the reader's interest and entice them to learn more about optics. Such a disproportional amount of 'edutaining' content might well be due to Gellius's editorial choices: Varro could have covered the basics of all optical disciplines in equal measure.

Identifying Varro's sources for optics seems a futile endeavor: the text provides us with the most basic and unoriginal information present in any optical treatise (i. e. the small size of objects remote from the eye). Catoptrics, on the other hand, is described in greater detail. Unfortunately, our sources on catoptrics are in a lamentable state. Pseudo-Euclid's *Catoptrics* is a late compilation authored most probably by Theon of Alexandria⁵⁷ (although it is possible that it contains some traces of original Euclid's *Catoptrics*).⁵⁸ Meanwhile, Hero of Alexandria's *Catoptrics* survives in a Medieval Latin translation of a poorly-preserved Greek text.⁵⁹ Books three, four, and five of Ptolemy's *Optics* are our third and last source on catoptrics, and are also a Medieval Latin translation – this time from Arabic – with the fifth book incomplete. Our text, on the other hand, does not provide us with enough scientific data that would allow us to determine its place in the development of catoptrics. The magnification of objects seen in water had been known since at least Archimedes,⁶⁰ and the mirror reflections described by Gellius are also not unique to any other catoptrical treatise.

⁵⁵ Cf. Posidonius: *quae causa in speculo imagines exprimat sciet sapiens: illud tibi geometres potest dicere, quantum abesse debeat corpus ab imagine et qualis forma speculi quales imagines reddat* (Sen. *Epist.* 88. 27 = F 90 E–K).

⁵⁶ On physical theories of vision see Thibodeau 2016, 130–144.

⁵⁷ Heiberg 1882, 148 ff.

⁵⁸ See Lejeune 1957.

⁵⁹ For references, see Lejeune 1957, 5.

⁶⁰ Lejeune 1957, 176–179.

b) Harmonics and mathematical education

(*Text continues*) Κανονική autem longitudes et altitudines vocis emetitur. Longior mensura vocis ῥυθμός dicitur, altior μέλος. Est et alia species, quae appellatur μετρική, per quam syllabarum longarum et brevium et mediocrium iunctura et modus congruens cum principiis geometriae aurium mensura examinatur. “Sed haec”, inquit M. Varro, “aut omnino non discimus aut prius desistimus, quam intellegamus, cur discenda. Voluptas autem”, inquit, “vel utilitas talium disciplinarum in postprincipiis existit, cum perfectae absolutaeque sunt; in principiis vero ipsis ineptae et insuaves videntur” (Gell. *NA* 16. 18).

Canonics, on the other hand, measures the durations and pitches of sounds. The measure of the duration of sounds is called ῥυθμός, and the measure of their pitch is called μέλος. There is also another variety of canonics which is called metric, by which the combination of long and short syllables, and those which are neither long nor short, and the verse measure according to the principles of geometry are examined with the aid of the ears. “But these things”, says Marcus Varro, “we either do not learn at all, or we leave off before we know why they ought to be learned. But the pleasure”, he says, “and the advantage of such sciences appear in their later study, when they have been completely mastered; but in their mere elements they seem foolish and unattractive”.⁶¹

Ancient harmonics existed in two versions: mathematical and empirical. The first stems from Pythagoreans, who discovered certain mathematical ratios of concordant intervals. Metaphysically, these relations provided a model for a “harmonious” universe. The empirical branch of harmonics meanwhile first appeared among practical musicians and was further developed by Aristoxenus of Tarentum in the late fourth century BCE.⁶² Aristoxenus dismissed the mathematical approach and insisted that music exists only in the domain accessible to hearing. Harmonics is commonly viewed as a science subordinate to arithmetic, not as a part of geometry.

According to Gellius, harmonics is a part of geometry related to the ears, which, in addition to optics, is based upon the spaces and intervals between lines and on number ratios.⁶³ Another musical discipline is metrics, “by which the combination of long and short syllables, and those which are neither long nor short, and the verse measure according

⁶¹ Tr. Rolfe 1927, 189, with modifications.

⁶² Barker 2018, 428–448.

⁶³ He uses Hellenistic term ‘canonics’, which suggests a Hellenistic source.

to the principles of geometry are examined with the aid of the ears". Fortunately, elsewhere in Gellius, we have an example of what is meant by geometrical principles applied to the verse meters (Gell. *NA*. 18. 15. 2):

M. etiam Varro in libris disciplinarum scripsit observasse sese in versu hexametro, quod omnimodo quintus semipes verbum finiret et quod priores quinque semipedes aequae magnam vim haberent in efficiendo versu atque alii posteriores septem, idque ipsum ratione quadam geometrica fieri disserit.⁶⁴

Varro might be unique in presenting harmonics as a part of geometry,⁶⁵ but we have to be very careful in drawing far-reaching conclusions from this fact. We have already seen that Varro uses the term 'geometry' extremely generously, as an umbrella term for *μαθήματα*.

Let us look whether it is possible to place our fragment inside different harmonical approaches. On the one hand, it certainly does have some features of Pythagorean harmonics, as the numerical ratios are used to denote intervals between notes. More surprising features include *ratio geometrica* in verses, contrasted with a feature of an empirical approach, i. e. *aurium mensura*. A more elaborate classification of different harmonic approaches exists: Ptolemais of Cyrene – placed by Andrew Barker in the first century BCE – identifies five groups of harmonic theorists based on the roles assigned to reason and perception (Porph. *Harm.* 25. 3 – 26. 5).⁶⁶ One of the five groups consists of those who favor reason, but allow perception an auxiliary role. Ptolemais ascribes this approach to some of the Pythagoreans. Didymus characterizes the same group as follows (Porph. *Harm.* 26. 18–24):

They adopt [from perception] certain kindling sparks ... and construct the theorems that are put together out of them through reason on its own, taking no further notice of perception. Hence on occasions when only what follows rationally is carefully preserved, and perception bears witness against it, it is possible for them to be not in the least disturbed by this sort of discord, but to pin their faith upon reason and dismiss perception as going astray.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ This fragment is further elucidated by Augustine (*De musica* 5. 12. 26), see Holford-Strevens 1994, 483–486.

⁶⁵ Creese 2010, 225.

⁶⁶ Barker 2018, 441.

⁶⁷ Tr. Barker 2018, 242–243.

This approach seems to be a good match for the one adopted by Varro.

Varro's educational comment on the lamentable state of mathematical education is congruent with everything we have seen so far: during his time, Roman mathematical education was pretty basic. It stopped well before students were able to enjoy the fruits of such an education. Varro's book was directed at those who had already completed the standard school curriculum and wanted to study rhetoric or philosophy. *Disciplinae* provided them with the very basics of each subject and introduced them to some of the most famous scientific discoveries. The practical character of the book was ensured by the sources that Varro used, i.e. various introductions to μαθήματα. However, the question of whether the book was used for self-education or in class depends not solely on the book itself, but also on the state of post-school education in Varro's time. As seen in the example of Diodotus in the introduction to this article, mathematical education was private, which means that each tutor would choose study materials according to the students' needs and abilities. Varro's book, though very basic in nature, must have been quite popular with beginners, as it probably was at the time the only book in Latin to cover the fundamentals of all disciplines, making it more accessible to readers.

Sofia Larionova

Saint-Petersburg State Pediatric Medical University
salamandrina-na-na@mail.ru

Bibliography

- A. Barker, "Harmonics", in: A. Jones, L. C. Taub (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Science. I. Ancient Science* (Cambridge 2018) 428–448.
- S. A. Barney et al. (ed., tr.), *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge 2006).
- R. Barrow, "The Persistence of Ancient Education", in: W. M. Bloomer (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Education* (Malden–Oxford 2015) 281–291.
- S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (London 1977).
- J. Bostock, H. T. Riley (tr.), *The Natural History of Pliny I* (London 1855).
- H. Cherniss, *The Riddle of the Early Academy* (Berkeley 1945).
- M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in Ancient World* (London 1971).
- Th. Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology* (Cleveland 1967).
- D. Creese, *The Monochord in Ancient Greek Harmonic Science* (Cambridge 2010).
- S. Cuomo, *Ancient Mathematics* (Routledge 2001).
- H. Dahlmann, "Terentius Varro", *RE* 6 (1935) 1172–1277.

- P. A. D'Alessandro, "Agostino, Claudiano Mamerto, Cassiodoro e i *Disciplinarum Libri* di Varrone", in: E. Degani, G. Gnoli, S. Mariotti, L. Munzi (eds.), *Mousa: Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli* (Bologna 1997) 357–370.
- F. Della Corte, *Varrone. Il terzo gran lume romano* (Genova 1954).
- H. Diller, "ΟΨΙΣ ΑΔΗΛΩΝ ΤΑ ΦΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΑ", *Hermes* 67 (1932) 14–42.
- H. Fuchs, *Augustin und der antike Friedensgedanke. Untersuchungen zum neunzehnten Buch der Civitas dei* (Berlin 1926).
- H. Fuchs, "Enkyklios Paideia", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1962) 365–398.
- F. Gasti, "Convertire l'enciclopedia: Agostino e Varrone", in: S. Rocchi, C. Mussini (eds.), *Imagines Antiquitatis. Representations, Concepts, Receptions of the Past in Roman Antiquity and the Early Italian Renaissance* (Berlin–Boston 2017) 303–318.
- G. R. Giardina, *Erone di Alessandria. Le radici filosofico-matematiche della tecnologia applicata. Definitiones. Testo, traduzione e commento* (Catania 2003).
- A. D. Godley (tr.), *Herodotus I* (Cambridge 1920).
- I. Hadot, *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique* (Paris 1984).
- I. Hadot, "Les aspects sociaux et institutionnels des sciences et de la médecine dans l'Antiquité tardive", *Antiquité tardive* 6 (1998) 233–250.
- J. W. Halporn, M. Vessey (tr.), *Cassiodorus. Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul* (Liverpool 2004).
- H. C. Hamilton, W. Falconer (tr.), *The Geography of Strabo I* (London 1853).
- J. L. Heiberg, *Litterärgeschichtliche Studien über Euklid* (Leipzig 1882).
- R. D. Hicks (ed., tr.), *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers I* (Cambridge 1925).
- L. Holford-Strevens, "Parva Gelliana", *CQ* 44 (1994) 480–489.
- C. Huffman, *Archytas of Tarentum. Pythagorean, Philosopher and Mathematician King* (Cambridge 2005).
- W. Knorr, "Ἀριθμητικὴ στοιχείωσις", *Historia Mathematica* 20 (1993) 180–192.
- F. Kühnert, *Allgemeinbildung und Fachbildung in der Antike* (Berlin 1961).
- K. Lachmann, *Die Schriften der römischen Feldmesser I* (Berlin 1848).
- A. Lejeune, *Recherches sur la Catoptrique grecque* (Bruxelles 1957).
- C. T. Lewis, Ch. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford 1879).
- H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité* (Paris 1964).
- H.-I. Marrou, "Les arts libéraux dans l'antiquité Classique", *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Âge* (Montréal 1969) 5–27.
- R. Palmer, *The Archaic Community of the Romans* (Cambridge 1970).
- U. Pizzani, "Il filone enciclopedico nella patristica da S. Agostino a S. Isidoro di Siviglia", *Augustinianum* 14 (1974) 667–696.
- U. Pizzani, "La sezione musicale dei *Disciplinarum libri* di Varrone reatino", *Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi varroniani* 2 (1976) 457–476.
- O. Regenbogen, "Eine Forschungsmethode antiker Naturwissenschaft", *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik* 1 (1930) 130–182.
- F. W. Ritschl, "De M. Terentii Varronis disciplinarum libris commentarius", *Kleine Philologische Schriften* III (Leipzig 1877) 352–402.

- F. E. Robbins, “Posidonius and the Sources of Pythagorean Arithmology”, *CPh* 15 (1920) 309–322.
- J. C. Rolfe (tr.), *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius* I–III (London – New York 1927).
- U. Schindel, “*De septem artibus liberalibus* – ein unedierter anonymen Traktat aus dem 8. Jahrhundert”, in: P. G. Schmidt, A. Bihrer (eds.), *Nova de veteribus: mittel- und neulateinische Studien für P. G. Schmidt* (München–Leipzig 2004) 132–144.
- U. Schindel, “Ps. Boethius, Cassiodor und Varro, *De geometria*”, *RhM* 149 (2006) 99–108.
- D. Shanzer, “Licentius’s Verse Epistle to Augustine”, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 37 (1991) 110–143.
- D. R. Shanzer, “Augustine’s Disciplines: *Silent diutius musae Varronis?*” in: K. Pollmann, M. Vessey (eds.), *Augustine and the Disciplines: From Cassiciacum to Confessions* (Oxford 2005) 69–112.
- M. Simon, “Zur Abhängigkeit spätromischer Enzyklopädien der *artes liberales* von Varros *Disciplinarum libri*”, *Philologus* 110 (1966) 88–101.
- A. Solignac, “Doxographies et manuels dans la formation philosophique de Saint Augustin”, *Recherches augustiniennes* 1 (1958) 113–148.
- W. H. Stahl, *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts. I. The Quadrivium of Martianus Capella* (Columbia 1971).
- T. Thibodeau, “Ancient optics: theories and problems of vision”, in: G. L. Irby (ed.), *A Companion to Science, Technology, and Medicine in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Malden 2016) 130–144.
- I. Thomas (ed., tr.), *Selections Illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics II* (London–Cambridge 1957).
- K. Tittel, *De Gemini stoici studiis mathematicis quaestiones philologiae* (Leipzig 1895).
- K. Tittel, “Geminus”, *RE* 7 (1912) 1026–1050.
- H. Tredennick (tr.), *Aristotle. The Metaphysics* (London – New York 1933).
- L. Zhmud, *The Origin of the History of Science in Classical Antiquity* (Berlin – New York 2006).

This article brings together the evidence concerning the subjects of the quadrivium in Varro’s *Disciplines* and provides a description of the book’s content, composition, and sources, while at the same time discussing the level of post-school mathematical education in Varro’s time. Polarizing views exist on the matter of post-school mathematical education, with some scholars placing it as early as the beginning of the Hellenistic period, and others linking its emergence to Neoplatonic circles in the fourth century CE. I argue that it is possible to attest to the existence of post-school mathematical education in the first century BCE, even though it was pretty basic in nature and did not go beyond the fundamentals of the subjects of the quadrivium, as the contents of Varro’s book suggest. The first section of the article covers Varro’s unconventional views on the origin of geometry: Varro rejects the Egyptian origin of geometry and traces its invention

back to the dawn of human civilization. The second section deals with Varro's geometrical definitions and their relation to the Euclidean tradition, showing that among his sources, there definitely were some Hellenistic introductions to μαθήματα. The final section focuses on Varro's conception of optics and canonics; here, his approach to canonics is identified as mostly mathematical with some empirical features.

В статье собраны свидетельства о предметах квадривиума в сочинении Варрона *Disciplinae*, дается описание его содержания, композиции и источников, а также обсуждается уровень послешкольного математического образования во времена Варрона. В научной среде существуют противоположные взгляды на проблему послешкольного математического образования: некоторые ученые относят его возникновение к началу эллинистического периода, а другие связывают его появление с неоплатоническими кругами в четвертом веке нашей эры. На деле существование послешкольного математического образования можно засвидетельствовать в первом веке до нашей эры, хотя оно было, в сущности, базовым и не выходило за рамки основ предметов квадривиума, как предполагает содержание книги Варрона. Первая часть статьи посвящена нетрадиционным взглядам Варрона на происхождение геометрии: Варрон отвергает традицию о египетском происхождении геометрии и относит ее изобретение ко времени возникновения человеческой цивилизации. Второй раздел посвящен геометрическим определениям Варрона и их связи с евклидовой традицией. В нем показано, что среди его источников определенно были некоторые эллинистические введения в μαθήματα. Заключительный раздел посвящен концепции оптики и каноники у Варрона: здесь его подход к канонике определяется как в основном математический с некоторыми эмпирическими особенностями.

Natalia Kuznetsova

CICEROS KRITIK AN DEM ANTONISCHEN PROVOKATIONSGESETZ*

1. Einführung

Provocatio ad populum ist in der römischen Literatur als Garantie der Freiheit vielfach gepriesen worden.¹ Die Provokationsgesetze werden vielfach erwähnt,² doch lassen die Quellen bezüglich des Provokationsverfahrens nicht Vieles gewinnen. Meistens geht es um Anerkennung des Berufungsrechts in bestimmten Fällen, dabei wird kein Wort darüber verloren, was nach der Berufung geschehen soll. Welcher Magistrat für das Berufungsverfahren zuständig war, auf welche Art und Weise sie vor dem Volk verhandelt wurde, welche Versammlung darüber abstimmte, – diese Fragen bleiben schwer zu beantworten.³ Was die Präzedenzfälle angeht, sind sie auch nicht hilfreich: viele stammen aus der frühen Republik und werden nicht selten als unhistorisch bestritten;⁴ die anderen sind viel zu kurz überliefert und lassen sich meistens nicht sicher rekonstruieren.⁵

Cic. *Phil.* I, 21–23 ist eine Primärquelle für ein Provokationsgesetz (nämlich für das antonische, 43 v.Chr.) und ist schon darum einer genaueren Betrachtung wert. Cicero versucht der Annahme des Gesetzes vorzubeugen und beschreibt die schlimmen Folgen, die es nach sich ziehen würde:

* Frau Alisa Kuznetsova sowie Frau Svetlana Dubova danken wir für ihre Hilfe bei der Übersetzung. Herrn Prof. Dr. Alexander Verlinsky und Herrn Prof. Dr. Michael Pozdnev geht unser Dank für treffende und hilfreiche Kritik. Ferner möchten wir uns bei Herrn Dr. Wjatscheslaw Chrustaljow für nützliche Hinweise herzlich bedanken. Unser besonderer Dank gilt Herrn Prof. em. Dr. Dr. h. c. J. von Ungern-Sternberg für weitgehende Hilfe und sachliche Kritik. Selbstverständlich bleiben alle Fehler in unserer Verantwortung.

¹ E. g. Cic. *De or.* II, 199–200; Liv. III, 45, 8; 55, 4. Cf. Wirszubsky 1968, 24–27. Eine provokationsfreie Gewalt wird im Gegensatz dazu als eine tyrannische oder königliche charakterisiert: Cic. *Rep.* II, 62; III, 44; Liv. II, 30, 5–6 (vgl. II, 18, 8); III, 36, 3–6; Dion. Hal. V, 70.

² U. Anm. 30.

³ Vgl. u. S. 260 ff.

⁴ Grundlegend Bleicken 1959a, 332–345.

⁵ S. u. S. 263–265.

21. Altera promulgata lex est ut et de vi et maiestatis damnati ad populum provocent, si velint. haec utrum tandem lex est an legum omnium dissolutio? quis est enim hodie cuius intersit istam legem †manere†?⁶ nemo reus est legibus illis, nemo quem futurum putemus: armis enim gesta numquam profecto in iudicium vocabuntur. ‘at res popularis’. utinam quidem aliquid velletis esse populare! omnes enim iam cives de rei publicae salute una et mente et voce consentiunt. quae est igitur ista cupiditas legis eius ferendae quae turpitudinem summam habeat, gratiam nullam? quid enim turpius quam qui maiestatem populi Romani minuerit per vim, eum damnatum iudicio ad eam ipsam vim reverti propter quam sit iure damnatus? 22. sed quid plura de lege disputo? quasi vero id agatur ut quisquam provocet: id agitur, id fertur, ne quis omnino umquam istis legibus reus fiat. quis enim aut accusator tam amens reperietur qui reo condemnato obici se multitudini conductae velit, aut iudex qui reum damnare audeat, ut ipse ad operas mercennarias statim protrahatur? non igitur provocatio ista lege datur, sed duae maxime salutares leges quaestionesque tolluntur. quid est aliud hortari adulescentis ut turbulenti, ut seditiosi, ut perniciosi cives velint esse? quam autem ad pestem furor tribunicius impelli non poterit his duabus quaestionibus de vi et maiestate sublati? 23. quid, quod obrogatur legibus Caesaris, quae iubent ei qui de vi itemque ei qui maiestatis damnatus sit aqua et igni interdicti? quibus cum provocatio datur, nonne acta Caesaris rescinduntur?

21. Man hat noch ein zweites Gesetz vorgeschlagen: dass denen, die

⁶ Das Problem ist offensichtlich: *istam legem manere* bedeutet entweder „dieses dein Gesetz bleibt in Kraft“ (cf. Cic. *Prov. cons.* 46; Tietze 1937) oder „dies bleibt ein Gesetz“ (= *istud legem manere*, vgl. Kühner–Stegmann 1971 §12. 1). Es geht aber um einen Gesetzesvorschlag, welcher keineswegs *manere* kann. Mindestens gibt Tietze 1937 keine Belege für solch einen Wortgebrauch. Freilich kann *manere* sich als Kopula dem *esse* nähern, vgl. Tietze 1937, 190, 13–70; aber die meisten Belegstellen werden auf die ersten Jahrhunderten n.Chr. datiert und es ist nicht sicher, ob sich das Verb nicht wörtlich interpretieren lässt. Die früheste Stelle gehört dem Lucretius und erweckt Zweifel (zur Diskussion: Munro–Anrade 1928, 159 und Bailey 1950, 935). – Was die Lesarten und Konjekturen angeht, steht *manere* oftmals ohne *crucis* – und ohne irgendwelche Erläuterungen (Clark 1918; Boulanger–Wuilleumier 1972; Ker 1995; Denniston 1926). Shackleton Bailey 1986 stellt *crucis* und schlägt im Apparatus *rogari* vor. Diese Konjektur ist von Ramsey 2003 aufgenommen. Andere Konjekturen (zit. nach Fedeli 1982): *venire* (in der Handschrift D, höchstwahrscheinlich eine Konjektur des Schreibers); *valere* Orelli, *sanciri* Halm u.a. Alle genannten Variante sind paläographisch nicht überzeugend. Die meisten Übersetzungen (Clark 1918; Boulanger–Wuilleumier 1972; Ker 1995; Grabar–Passek–Gorenshtein 1962 [М. Е. Грабарь–Пассек (изд.), В. О. Горенштейн (пер., комм.), Цицерон. Речь в двух томах. Том II. Годы 63–42 до н. э.]; die zitierte Nickel–Fuhrmann 2013) geben *manere* buchstäblich wieder; nur bei Shackleton Bailey 1986 (*loc. cit.*) steht: „interest in the enactment of such a law“.

wegen Gewaltanwendung oder Hochverrats verurteilt seien, die Berufung an die Volksversammlung offenstehen solle. Was ist das nun: ein Gesetz oder die Aufhebung aller Gesetze? Denn wem kann heutzutage daran liegen, dass dieses Gesetz existiert? Niemand steht aufgrund der genannten Gesetze vor Gericht, niemand muss, meine ich, künftig damit rechnen: was die Waffen durchsetzen, gelangt nie und nimmer vor ein Gericht. „Die Maßnahme ist doch volksfreundlich“. Ich wollte, ihr wärt *einmal* zu einer volksfreundlichen Tat bereit! Denn jetzt sind alle Bürger über das Wohl unseres Staates zu einer einstimmigen Meinung gekommen. Wozu also der Eifer, ein Gesetz einzubringen, mit dem man nur äußerste Schande und keinerlei Beifall ernten kann? Denn was ist schändlicher, als dass jemand, der sich durch Gewaltanwendung an der Hoheit des römischen Volkes vergangen hat, nach seiner gerichtlichen Verurteilung abermals die Gewalt anwendet, derentwegen er rechtmäßig verurteilt worden ist? **22.** Doch wozu noch lange von diesem Gesetz reden? Als ob es darum ginge, dass jemand Berufung einlegen kann. Darum geht es, das will man erreichen, dass niemand mehr aufgrund der genannten Gesetze vor Gericht gestellt wird. Denn wo ließe sich noch ein Ankläger auftreiben, hirnverbrannt genug, um sich im Falle des Schuldspruchs dem gedungenen Pöbel auszuliefern, wo ein Richter, der einen Angeklagten zu verurteilen wagte, um daraufhin selbst vor die bezahlten Knüppelbanden gezerrt zu werden? Nicht ein Recht auf Berufung will dieser Vorschlag einräumen, sondern zwei äußerst wirksame Gesetze und Gerichtshöfe will er beseitigen. Bedeutet das nicht, dass man die jungen Leute ermuntert, als streitsüchtige, als aufrührerische, als unheilstiftende Elemente der Bürgerschaft aufzutreten? Und zu welchen Ausschreitungen wird sich der Wahwitz der Tribunen nicht hinreißen lassen, wenn diese beiden Gerichtshöfe, die gegen Gewaltanwendung und Hochverrat, beseitigt sind? **23.** Widerstreitet das nicht den Gesetzen Caesars, die jedem, der wegen Gewaltanwendung, und jedem, der wegen Hochverrats verurteilt ist, die Strafe der Verbannung auferlegen? Wenn man denen das Recht auf Berufung gibt, hebt man dann etwa nicht die Anordnungen Caesars auf?⁷

Der angeführte Text ist leider die einzige Quelle zum Antonischen Gesetz. Es ist nichts mehr darüber bekannt. Falls das Gesetz verabschieden worden ist, muss es mit den anderen *acta Antonii* vom Senat außer Kraft gesetzt worden sein (Cic. *Phil.* XII, 11–12 lässt keinen Zweifel daran zu, dass alles, was Antonius gemacht hatte, – sei es seine Gesetze oder einfach

⁷ Übers. von M. Fuhrmann (Nickel–Fuhrmann 2013, 31–33) mit unseren unerheblichen Veränderungen.

einige Anordnungen, – für nichtig erklärt wurde).⁸ Ob die Antonischen Gesetze nach der *lex Titia* (43 v. Chr.) wieder in Kraft gesetzt wurden, bleibt fraglich.⁹ Es gibt keinerlei Belege dafür, dass die *lex Antonia de provocatione* irgendwann gültig war.

Doch gehört das Gesetz in die historisch sichere Zeit. Es ist zu überlegen, ob Ciceros Kritik etwas für die Geschichte des Provokationsrechts gewinnen lässt. Wir werden uns mit zweierlei Fragen beschäftigen:

1) Ist es möglich, das Provokationsverfahren *lege Antonia* aufgrund der angeführten Cicerostelle zu rekonstruieren?

2) Hatte die Antonische Reform etwas grundsätzlich Neues zum Inhalt oder geht es um bloße Erweiterung bzw. Anerkennung von damals schon bestehenden Möglichkeiten?

2. Das Verfahren

Cicero gibt den Inhalt des Gesetzesentwurfs nur ganz kurz wieder: *ut et de vi et maiestatis damnati ad populum provocent, si velint*. Offensichtlich folgt eine Volksversammlung auf die Provokation. In welcher Form aber sollte die Versammlung durchgeführt werden? Es sind folgende Möglichkeiten denkbar:

- ein Volksgericht (eine gerichtliche Zenturienversammlung, s.u.);¹⁰

⁸ Cf. Cic. *Phil.* X, 17; Cass. Dio XLVI, 36, 2; Manuwald 2007, 585.

⁹ Ramsey 2005 glaubt, dass mindestens die *lex Antonia de tertia decuria* (Cic. *Phil.* I, 19–20) wieder erlassen sei. Dafür gibt es gute Gründe, aber Ramseys Beweisführung gründet sich u.a. auf einer recht rätselhaften Pliniusstelle (*NH* XXXIII, 30), so können wir seine Schlussfolgerungen nicht ohne Weiteres annehmen. Die Fragen, die der Plinius-Exkurs (*NH* XXXIII, 29–36) stellt, sind zu kompliziert, um hier diskutiert zu werden.

¹⁰ Bleicken 1959b, 2455 f. Wenig einleuchtend ist seine frühere Interpretation des Antonischen Gesetzes (Bleicken 1959a, 367–368): er versucht zu beweisen, dass das Volksgericht nicht als eine zweite Instanz funktionieren sollte: Antonius wollte nur, „eine Entwicklung, die das Volksgericht durch die *Quaestio* ersetzt hatte, wieder rückgängig machen“. Welches Verfahren soll das bedeuten? Martin 1970, 78 und Lintott 1972, 239 Anm. 67 glauben, Bleicken habe einen *Ersatz* des Quästionengerichtes durch das Volksgericht gemeint, und lehnen so eine Vermutung ganz richtig ab. Bei Bleicken 1959b *loc. cit.* gibt es keine Spur dieser Meinung. Stattdessen wird hier das Antonische Gesetz als paradox charakterisiert: die Quästio sei ein rechtlicher Nachfolger des Volksgerichtes; die Provokation gegen eine *quaestio* gleiche einer gegen das Volksgericht selbst. Hier geht es um einen *Ersatz* sicher nicht. Entweder hat Bleicken seine Interpretation verändert, oder er hat auch 1959a, 367–368 etwas ganz Anderes gemeint. Vgl. u. 266 mit Anm. 50.

- eine nicht gerichtliche patrizisch-plebeische Volksversammlung;¹¹
- ein (nicht gerichtliches) *concilium plebis*.¹²

Soweit das Volk über das Schicksal eines Verurteilten entscheiden sollte, ist v. A. das Komitialgericht denkbar. Die Verhandlung *de capite civis* (*Phil. I, 23: legibus Caesaris, quae iubent... aqua et igni interdici?*)¹³ sollte vor den Zenturien verlaufen.¹⁴ Doch erwähnt Cicero kein Volksgericht und keine Zenturien, so lässt sich diese Annahme durch den Text

¹¹ Soweit wir wissen, wurde diese Möglichkeit nie vorgeschlagen. Wer aber mit Bleicken für die Provokation gegen den Oberpontifex eine Tribusversammlung des ganzen Volkes annimmt, müsste diese Variante beurteilen. S. u. 261 ff. Es ist zu bemerken, dass die Existenz von zwei verschiedenen Tribusversammlungen, nämlich der plebejischen (*concilium plebis*) und einer des ganzen Volkes (*comitia tributa*) manchmal bezweifelt wird. Erstens, gibt es Versuche zu zeigen, dass die Patrizier nach dem Ende der Ständekämpfe an den plebejischen Versammlungen teilgenommen haben. Dass diese Ansicht nicht begründet genug ist, hat Taylor 2003, 60–64 u. E. ganz überzeugend gezeigt. Zweitens glaubt Sandberg 2001, 105–110, dass es keine patrizisch-plebejische Tribusversammlung gab: jede Tribusversammlung war seiner Ansicht nach eine plebejische. Doch führt Sandberg selbst mindestens einen sicheren Präzedenzfall an, nämlich ein konsularisches Gesetz von 58 v. Chr., über welches die Tribus abgestimmt hatten (*ebd.* 109 Anm. 22). Diesen Fall hält Sandberg für eine Ausnahme aus der Regel und erklärt diese Ausnahme dadurch, dass in dieser Zeit viele republikanischen Normen nicht beachtet wurden. Diese Erklärung scheint uns nicht genügend zu sein. Bezüglich der Volksgerichte vgl. u. Anm. 14. So gehen wir davon aus, dass es Tribusversammlungen beider Arten gab. – Wir sind Herrn Dr. Wjatscheslaw Chrustaljow herzlich dankbar, der uns auf das Problem aufmerksam machte.

¹² Martin 1970, 77–86; Lintott 1972, 239 f.

¹³ Das ist der einzige Beleg für die cäsarischen *leges de vi et de maiestate*. Die in den juristischen Quellen vielfach erwähnten *leges Iuliae* sollen zur augusteischen Gesetzgebung zählen. Dass Cicero *Phil. I, 23* zwei verschiedene *leges Iuliae de vi et maiestatis* meint, wurde bezweifelt (z. B. Kunkel 1963, 748 f., vgl. 772), aber die Stelle lässt sich u. E. nicht anders verstehen. Dass die beiden Gesetze so sparsam belegt sind, ist nicht verwunderlich: es gibt auch andere cäsarische Gesetze, über welche so gut wie nichts bekannt ist, vgl., z. B., Suet. *Iul.* 42, 3. Die von Cicero und Sueton erwähnten Vorschriften könnten wahrscheinlich aus einer allumfassenden *lex Iulia iudiciaria* stammen. Aber kein „universelles“ Gesetz ist in der Zeit nach den XII Tafeln bekannt; und *duae maxime salutare leges quaestionesque* (*Phil. I, 22*) spricht dagegen.

¹⁴ Cic. *Rep.* II, 61; *Leg.* III, 11: *De capite civis nisi per maximum comitiatum... ne ferunto. Ibid.* III, 44 f. wird diese Norm den XII Tafeln zugeschrieben und *per maximum comitiatum* als „durch eine Zenturierversammlung“ interpretiert. Beides wurde stark bezweifelt (s. Dyck 2007, 544 f. und ausführlich Crawford 1996, 696–700). Unabhängig davon, ob Cicero Recht hat, gibt es keine Belege, dass ein Todesurteil in der Zeit nach den XII Tafeln von einer Tribusversammlung gefällt werden durfte. So nehmen wir an, dass die Geldstrafe normalerweise vor einer Tribusversammlung

nicht beweisen. Cicero konzentriert sich auf Gewaltszenen, die sich nach einer Berufung abspielen würden (*Phil.* I, 22: *quis enim eqs.*), und sagt kein Wort über das Verfahren. J. Martin folgert aus der angeführten Stelle, dass es um ein *concilium plebis* geht: *multitudo conducta, operae mercennariae* werde nie im Bezug auf eine Zenturienversammlung gesagt.¹⁵ Darum könne Cicero nur von einer Plebsversammlung sprechen.¹⁶ Dies ist auch von A. Lintott¹⁷ angenommen. Aber, wie sie beide richtig bemerkt haben (ohne daraus Folgerungen zu ziehen), spricht hier Cicero über eine *contio*.¹⁸ Wie die Worte *reo condemnato* und *statim* zeigen, geht es um Ereignisse, die *kurz nach* der Berufung geschehen würden. Cicero verliert kein Wort über die Stimmabgabe. In welcher Form sie auch durchgeführt werden sollte, die Ankläger und die Geschworenen haben seiner Meinung nach keine Chance, bis zu diesem Moment am Leben zu bleiben: der verurteilte Gewalttäter werde die Berufung an das Volk als Vorwand benutzen, um seine Knüppelbanden einzuschalten. Unter solchen Umständen spielt das Abstimmungsverfahren keine große Rolle. Ob Antonius in seinem Gesetzesentwurf ein Volksgericht oder Durchführung eines Plebiszits vorgeschrieben hatte, hat Cicero außer Acht gelassen.

Lintott scheint auch den in *Phil.* I, 22 erwähnten *furor tribunicius* auf das Berufungsverfahren zu beziehen: „Cicero believes that the bill

bzw. dem *concilium plebis* und die Todesstrafe – vor einer Zenturienversammlung verhandelt wurde. Zum Verlauf der Komitialgerichte s. Taylor 2003, 100–103; Thommen 1989, 147–151. Es wurde manchmal bezweifelt, dass das *concilium plebis* überhaupt ein Urteil fällen durfte, sowie, dass alle Kapitalverhandlungen vor Zenturien abgehalten wurden; s. Thommen *loc. cit.* zur Diskussion beider Fragen. Die von Lintott angeführten Beispiele für eine Tribusabstimmung *de capite civis* erwecken Zweifel, und manche betreffen das Komitialgericht überhaupt nicht (vgl. z. B. Lintott 1972, 243 über Liv. XXVI, 33).

¹⁵ Martin 1970, 78. Leider haben wir keinen Zugang zu der Martin 1970, 78 Anm. 1 zitierten Monographie. Martins Bemerkung, dass *operae* oft im Zusammenhang mit *contiones* und plebejischen Versammlungen gebräuchlich ist, stimmt mindestens für die Sprache Ciceros, vgl. Flury 1976, 665, 52–65. Doch haben die *operae Clodianae* einmal an einer Abstimmung über das konsularische Gesetz teilgenommen: Cic. *Att.* I, 14, 5, vgl. dazu Taylor 2003, 77; 146 Anm. 43. Es mag hier um eine Tribusversammlung gehen, doch sicher um keine plebejische. Folglich ist der Zusammenhang zwischen *operae* und *concilia plebis* nicht so eindeutig, wie Martin glaubt.

¹⁶ Martin 1970, 77 f.

¹⁷ Lintott 1972, 239 f.

¹⁸ Martin 1970, 78 erwähnt zwar, dass Cicero eine *contio* beschreiben könnte, aber zieht diese Variante nicht in Betracht. Lintott 1972, 240 sieht, dass Cicero darüber spricht, was vor der Abstimmung geschehen würde. Doch zieht er daraus keine Folgerungen und stimmt Martin zu.

will favour seditious tribunes... *who will use their old gangs to secure eventual acquittal*“ (Hervorgehoben von uns. – N. K).¹⁹ Es ist nicht ganz klar, was Lintott hier eigentlich meint. Meint er einen Tribun, der die Appellation aufgenommen haben würde, dann ist seine Annahme offenbar irrig: Cicero beschreibt hier die kritische Lage, in welche Rom *his duabus quaestionibus... sublati* geraten würde. So hat auch der *furor tribunicus* mit der Berufungsversammlung nichts zu tun. Meint Lintott bloß, dass ein ehemaliger Tribun (nach seiner Verurteilung) die Möglichkeit bekommt, seine Banden zu rufen, dann hat er Recht, aber die Erwähnung von *furor tribunicus* beweist in diesem Fall überhaupt nichts.

Wir kommen zum Ergebnis, dass sich aus Cic. *Phil.* I, 21–23 keine Angaben zum Provokationsverfahren *lege Antonia* gewinnen lassen. Ist es möglich, das Verfahren anhand anderer Quellen zu rekonstruieren?

Höchstwahrscheinlich hat Antonius das Verfahren vorgeschrieben, welches im Falle einer Berufung üblich war. Was aber üblich war, ist eine seit Langem diskutierte Frage. Für Mommsen²⁰ war *provocatio ad populum* seit Anfang der Republik ein unentbehrlicher Teil jedes Volksgerichts: der Angeklagte würde nach der *iudicatio / multae inrogatio* (über welche vgl. Cic. *Leg.* III, 6 und *Dom.* 45) provozieren. Die Berufung ist für die meisten Volksgerichte nicht erwähnt, doch sei sie anzunehmen. Die Volksversammlung würde von dem Magistrat geleitet, gegen dessen Urteil die Berufung gerichtet wäre. Aus der Kritik an dieser Ansicht²¹ ist die heute verbreitete Theorie entwickelt worden:²² das Berufungsrecht sei im Laufe der Ständekämpfe entstanden und würde nicht früher als im Jahre 300 gesetzlich anerkannt. Ursprünglich wäre die *provocatio* ein bloßer Hilferuf eines Plebeiers an seine Standesgenossen gegen die magistratische Gewalt. Demgemäß würde sie von den Volkstribunen angenommen und vor der plebejischen Versammlung verhandelt: als Antwort auf die Berufung würde ein Plebiszit beschlossen, dass die Plebeier den Provokanten zu schützen bereit seien (oder nicht seien). Eine Versammlung der Plebejer sei die ursprüngliche Form des Provokationsverfahrens, und sie selbst habe

¹⁹ Lintott 1972, 240 Anm. 70.

²⁰ Seine Beschreibung des Provokationsverfahrens: Mommsen 1887b, 351–360; 1899, 161–171.

²¹ Zur Forschungsgeschichte: Bleicken 1959a, 325–332; Bleicken 1959b, 2456–2463; Kunkel 1962, 9–33; Martin 1970, 72–75; Lintott 1972, 226–228; Mackay 1994, 51–56.

²² Zu ihrer Begründung vgl. Bleicken 1957, 446–468; Bleicken 1959a; Bleicken 1959b; Martin 1970; Lintott 1972. Diese Theorie ist nicht allgemein angenommen; den Ansichten Mommsens schließen sich z.B. Mackay 1994, 51–56 und Brennan 2000, 125–127 an.

nicht einen rechtlichen, sondern einen politischen Charakter gehabt. Am Ende der Ständekämpfe sei das erste Provokationsgesetz erlassen worden, nämlich die *lex Valeria* 300 v. Chr. Welches Verfahren sie vorgeschrieben hat, hat Bleicken außer Acht gelassen, da das Berufungsrecht am Ende der Ständekämpfe seinen Ansichten nach nicht mehr nötig gewesen sei. Nach 300 v. Chr. würde die Provokation nur gegen die pontifikale Geldstrafe eingelegt.²³ Diese Fälle²⁴ – die einzigen, die Bleicken als historisch sichere betrachtet,²⁵ – sind ein Problem für sich; sie haben einen ziemlich außerordentlichen Charakter (s. u., S. 264–265). Bleicken folgert daraus, dass die Provokation, auch nachdem sie gesetzlich anerkannt worden war, ein politisches Schutzmittel blieb, und ihre Einlegung mehr von der politischen Lage als von den Gesetzesvorschriften abhängig war.²⁶ Hinsichtlich des Verfahrens bedeutete das, dass auch dieses nicht von einem Gesetz, sondern von den Umständen für jeden konkreten Fall bestimmt wurde. Diese Folgerung hat Bleicken nicht ausdrücklich formuliert, doch nimmt er in verschiedenen Fällen verschiedene Variante an: ursprünglich sei im Falle einer Berufung das Plebiszit durchgeführt worden;²⁷ die Provokation gegen den Oberpontifex wurde vor einer patrizisch-plebejischen Tribusversammlung verhandelt;²⁸ und für die *lex Antonia* scheint Bleicken ein Volksgericht einzunehmen.²⁹

Die Geschichte des Berufungsrecht ist hier nicht zu rekonstruieren. Die Kritik an den Ansichten Mommsens scheint grundsätzlich richtig zu sein, deshalb nehmen wir die von Bleicken entwickelte Theorie an, auch wenn manche ihrer Punkte noch einer Verbesserung bedürfen. Es gab mindestens vier historisch gesicherte Provokationsgesetze,³⁰ und es ist – *pace* Bleicken – unglaublich, dass keines von ihnen ein Provokationsverfahren vorgesehen hat. Kaum anzunehmen ist auch, dass das vorgesehene Verfahren im Falle einer Berufung nicht beachtet wurde.

²³ Bleicken glaubt, dass Rabirius im J. 63 (u., S. 262–263) keine Berufung eingelegt hat.

²⁴ Liste u. Anm. 38.

²⁵ Bleicken 1959a, 341–345.

²⁶ Bleicken 1959a, 345; 359.

²⁷ Bleicken 1959a, 345–359.

²⁸ Bleicken 1957, 463; 1959a, 342. Er scheint dies dadurch zu erklären, dass es in diesen Fällen um Religion ging – der Bereich, mit welchem die Volkstribune nichts zu tun hatten.

²⁹ O. Anm. 10.

³⁰ Cic. *Rep.* II, 53–55 spricht von 2 *leges Valeriae* und 3 *leges Porciae*. Die von ihm erwähnten Valerischen Gesetze sind als Doubletten der dritten (die einzige Erwähnung: Liv. X, 9, 3–6) verdächtig. Die Übersichten der Provokationsgesetzgebung: Bleicken 1959b, 2445–2456; Rotondi 1912, 74.

Auch wenn die Einlegung einer Berufung von der politischen Lage völlig abhängig blieb, dürfte das Verfahren nach dem Muster verlaufen sein, das in den Gesetzen vorgeschrieben war. Welches, ist nicht belegt.³¹ Die Folgerungen sind aus den Präzedenzfällen zu ziehen.

Da es im Antonischen Gesetz um Todesstrafe ging, sind für uns die Fälle einer Berufung *de capite civis* von entscheidender Bedeutung. Es gibt u. W. nur drei Fälle,³² unter welchen nur einer historisch gesichert ist – der Rabiriusprozess 63 v. Chr. Rabirius wurde von den Perduellionsduumviren zum Tode verurteilt. Die Berufung des Rabirius ist gut belegt.³³ Sie blieb von Bleicken und Martin unbeachtet, da Bleicken die entsprechenden Unterlagen für gefälscht hielt.³⁴ Berufung des Rabirius wurde vor den Zenturien verhandelt. Höchstwahrscheinlich war die Versammlung eine gerichtliche.³⁵ D.h., die Berufung *de capite civis* wurde vor einem Volksgericht verhandelt. Wie wir gesehen haben, widerspricht Ciceros Kritik an dem Antonischen Gesetz keineswegs der Annahme, Antonius habe ein Volksgericht vorgeschrieben.

³¹ Neben der Provokation wird mehrmals das Volksgericht erwähnt (z. B. Liv. II, 27, 12; vgl. Ogilvie 1965, 304; Liv. III, 56, 5; VIII, 33, 8; Dion. Hal. V, 19, 4), doch ist es möglich, dass in der Wahrheit nicht eine gerichtliche Versammlung, sondern bloß eine Volksentscheidung gemeint wird.

³² (1) 324 v. Chr. (Broughton 1951, 147 f.). Liv. VIII, 33, 7–8 im Laufe des Konflikts zwischen dem Diktator L. Papirius Cursor und seinem Reiterobersten (Liv. VIII, 32–35; vgl. Cass. Dio VIII, frg. 36, 1–7; Val. Max. II, 7, 8; Frontin. *Strat.* IV, 1, 39; (Ps.-)Aurel. Vict. *De viris ill.* 31–32; Eutrop. 2, 8); die nur von Livius ausdrücklich erwähnte Berufung hatte keine Abstimmung zur Folge, da der Diktator freiwillig nachgab. (2) Die Horatiuslegende (Liv. I, 26; Dion. Hal. III, 22, 3–6; Val. Max. VI, 3, 6; VIII, 1 abs. 1; Fest p. 380 L. s. v. *sororium tigillum*; Schol. Bob. 113 Stangl). Die Art der Volksversammlung spielt keine Rolle und ist nicht belegt. (3) Der Rabiriusprozess aus dem Jahre 63 v. Chr., der weiter unten erörtert wird.

³³ Suet. *Iul.* 12; Cassius Dio XXXVII, 27, 3–28, 4. Auch die Zeugnisse über Horatiusprozess (o. Anm. 32) setzen voraus, dass im Prozess vor den Perduellionsduumviren die Provokation möglich war. Der Rabiriusprozess wurde viel diskutiert. Unsere Stellungnahme zu seiner Rekonstruktion wurde Kuznetsova 2017 begründet.

³⁴ Bleicken 1959a, 333–341. Der Grund liegt darin, dass das Duumviralverfahren dem von Mommsen rekonstruierten Muster des Provokationsprozesses viel zu ähnlich ist. Vgl. aber u. Anm. 61.

Lintott 1972, 261 f. nimmt dagegen die Provokation des Rabirius an; doch hat diese Berufung seiner Ansicht nach nicht eine Volksversammlung, sondern die Aufhebung des Urteils zur Folge gehabt. Darum dient der Rabiriusprozess auch nicht für Lintott als Musterbeispiel des Berufungsverfahrens.

³⁵ Die von Cassius Dio (XXXVII, 27, 3 – 28, 4) beschriebene Volksabstimmung kann nur eine Zenturierversammlung sein; nach ihrer Vereitelung wurde der ganze Prozess nichtig (*ibid.*), was mit den von Cic. *Dom.* 45 belegten Normen des Volksgerichts völlig übereinstimmt. S. Kuznetsova 2017, 294–296.

Beide Martin und Lintott glauben, dass eine Berufung normalerweise vor einer plebejischen Versammlung verhandelt worden sei. Lintott ist geneigt, jede Erwähnung der Volksentscheidung über eine beliebige Strafe und sowie jede Appellation an die Volkstribunen mit der Provokation zu verbinden, – wie wir glauben, nicht überzeugend, da die Provokation meistens nicht belegt ist.³⁶ Martin zieht diese Folgerung aus Cic. *Phil.* I, 21 ff. – wie wir gezeigt zu haben hoffen, unbegründet, – und aus den Fällen der Berufung gegen die vom Oberpontifex verhängte Geldstrafe.³⁷ Sie sind bedenkenswert.

Es geht um insgesamt sechs Fälle der Strafe, unter welchen die Berufung vier Mal eingelegt wurde.³⁸ Wie es schon mehrmals bemerkt wurde, ist das Verfahren dem vor dem Volksgericht nicht ähnlich.³⁹ Die Fälle sind ungleichmäßig belegt und manche bedürfen einer Rekonstruktion. Doch verlaufen sie alle ähnlich genug, um dasselbe Muster für die ganze Reihe anzunehmen: ein Priester, der meistens zugleich ein Magistrat ist, will etwas machen, was seine magistratischen Pflichten fordern.⁴⁰ Dabei aber wurden irgendwelche religiöse Vorschriften verletzt, welche er als Priester beachten sollte. Deswegen verhängt der Oberpontifex eine Geldstrafe. Der Bestrafte provoziert, wonach das Volk entscheidet, ob die Strafe zu bezahlen ist. Für einen der Fälle sind Tribus erwähnt (Liv. XL, 42, 10),

³⁶ Lintott 1972, 238–246.

³⁷ Martin 1970, 77–83.

³⁸ Eingehende Analyse: Bleicken 1957, 450–455. Die Provokation ist dreimal belegt: Liv. XXXVII, 51, 1–6; XL, 42, 8–11 (beides Anfang 2. Jhs v.Chr.) und die stark korrupte Festusstelle pp. 462, 464 L, der Vorgang lässt sich nicht sicher datieren, s. Bleicken 1957, 454 f. In Cic. *Phil.* XI, 18 wird eine Volksentscheidung erwähnt; da der Fall den oben genannten sehr ähnlich ist, soll auch diese Volksentscheidung auf die Provokation gefolgt sein. D.h., es geht um 4 Fälle einer Berufung gegen den Oberpontifex insgesamt. Es bleiben noch zwei Fälle. Im frühesten Fall (Liv. *Per.* XIX; Val. Max. I, 1, 2) wurde die Strafe verhängt, gegen welche keine Berufung eingelegt wurde. Im zweiten Fall (Liv. *Per.* XLVII) ist nichts sicher zu sagen.

³⁹ Bleicken 1957, 461–467; weitere Lit. bei Martin 1970, 80 Anm. 2–3 und Briscoe 1981, 370. Unkonsequenterweise bemerkt Bleicken (1959a, 359), das Volksprozess sei in diesen Fällen ähnlich dem Anklageverfahren der anderen Volksgerichte gewesen. Was er dabei meint, bleibt uns unklar.

⁴⁰ Unter Ausnahme von zwei Fällen: Festus pp. 462, 464 L. (Konflikt zwischen einem Priester und dem Oberpontifex, dessen Befehl seiner religiösen Pflicht widersprach; das Volk hat den Priester von der Strafe befreit) und Liv. *Per.* XLVII: *Cn. Tremellio pr. multa dicta est, quod cum M. Aemilio Lepido, pontifice maximo, iniuriose contenderat, sacrorumque quam magistratum ius potentius fuit.* – „Über den Prätor Gnaeus Tremellius wurde eine Strafe verhängt, weil er mit dem Oberpontifex M. Aemilius Lepidus in einen unwürdigen Streit geraten war; und das religiöse Recht setzte sich gegenüber dem magistratischen durch“ (übers. N. K.). Cn. Tremellius war kein Priester, s. Broughton 1951, 446; Broughton 1952, 627.

was freilich keine Folgerungen hinsichtlich des Verfahrens ziehen lässt.⁴¹ Wichtiger ist die Weise, auf welche Livius (*ibid.*; vgl. XXXVII, 51, 6) und Cicero (*Phil.* XI, 18) den Volksentscheid wiedergeben: beantwortet wurde nicht nur die Frage nach der Geldstrafe, sondern auch die Frage, ob der Priester dem Oberpontifex unter den gegebenen Umständen gehorchen sollte. Dies klingt nicht nach einem Urteil, sondern nach einem Gesetz bzw. einem Plebiszit. Es ist nicht belegt, ob die gegebenen Fälle vor dem *populus* oder vor der *plebs* verhandelt wurden.⁴² Martin glaubt, es sei die *plebs* gewesen, da die Provokation ursprünglich ein plebejisches Institut war und da ein *concilium plebis* für die Provokation seiner Meinung nach durch Cic. *Phil.* I, 22 belegt ist. J. Martin bemerkt, dass kein einziges Wort in den Quellen auf einen außerordentlichen Charakter dieser Vorgänge hinweist, und vermutet, dass alle anderen Provokationsfälle nach demselben Muster verlaufen seien.⁴³

Die plebejische Versammlung wird von Cic. *Phil.* I, 22 nicht bezeugt. Vor welcher Volksversammlung die Berufung gegen den Oberpontifex verhandelt wurde, ist auch nicht belegt. Martin hat seinerseits Recht, wenn er von diesen Fällen in seiner Rekonstruktion des Berufungsverfahrens ausgeht, da er Bleicken zustimmt, dass keine anderen Fälle historisch sicher seien. Und da der Volksbeschluss sich von einem Gerichtsurteil unterschied, bleibt Martin nur die Wahl zwischen der patrizisch-plebejischen Tribusversammlung (so Bleicken, o. S. 261) und dem *concilium plebis*, welches zur Geschichte des Berufungsrechts gut passt. Die plebejische Versammlung sei demgemäß wenn auch nicht die einzig mögliche, so doch eine wahrscheinliche Variante.

Doch sind die Berufungen gegen den Oberpontifex nur ganz vorsichtig zu benutzen. Sie sind dadurch verwickelt, dass die Strafe gerade in Hinblick darauf verhängt war, was der Bestrafte als Magistrat oder Priester tun *sollte*. So konnte die Frage nach der Multstrafe nicht ohne Entscheidung des damit verbundenen Konflikts der Rechte beantwortet werden. Die angegebenen Zeugnisse machen den Eindruck, als ob im Rahmen eines Berufungsverfahrens auch solche Probleme wie Provinzenverteilung (Liv. XXXVII, 51, 1–6), Kriegführung (Cic. *Phil.* XI, 18) oder Niederlegung eines Amtes (Liv. XL, 42, 8–11) entschieden wurden. Keine andere Quelle lässt daran denken, dass dies im Falle einer Provokation üblich war. Weder Livius noch Cicero erwähnen, wie man

⁴¹ Briscoe 1981, 370.

⁴² Freilich sagt Liv. XXXVII, 51, 5 *iussu populi* und XL, 42, 9 *certatum ad populum*; auch spricht Cic. *Phil.* XI, 18 vom *populus*. Doch wird *populus* öfters statt *plebs* genannt, vgl. die Kuznetsova 2017, 286 Anm. 35 angeführte Literatur.

⁴³ Martin 1970, 79–83.

nach der Provokation zu der von ihnen berichteten Kompromisslösung kam. Solange diese Frage unbeantwortet bleibt, können die Fälle nicht als Musterbeispiel für das Berufungsverfahren benutzt werden, da zwischen der Berufung und der Volksversammlung etwas passieren konnte, was den Gang des Verfahrens beeinflusste. Schließlich bieten die Fälle keine gute Analogie zum Antonischen Gesetz, in welchem es nicht um eine Geld- sondern um eine Todesstrafe geht, und das Volk nur die Frage nach der Begnadigung und keine andere beantworten konnte. Wir sind in einer besseren Lage, als Martin, da wir von dem Prozess des Rabirius ausgehen können. Dieser Präzedenzfall bietet eine viel bessere Analogie zum Antonischen Gesetz. In diesem Prozess wurde das Volksgericht durchgeführt. Da es keinen anderen Fall der Provokation gegen eine Todesstrafe gibt, ist das Volksgericht für alle derartigen Vorgänge anzunehmen.⁴⁴

Es bleibt die Frage, ob die Provokation gegen ein Gerichtsurteil vor dem Antonischen Antrag möglich war oder ob Antonius etwas grundsätzlich Neues vorgeschlagen hat.

3. Die Berufung gegen ein Gerichtsurteil

Th. Mommsen⁴⁵ hielt die Provokation im Falle eines Quästionenurteils für unmöglich, da die Berufung bzw. die Suspension des Berufungsrechts niemals erwähnt ist.⁴⁶ Bleicken charakterisiert das Antonische Gesetz als paradox: es „sollte eine Entwicklung, die das Volksgericht durch die Quaestion ersetzt hatte, wieder rückgängig machen“;⁴⁷ „die *provocatio* gegen sie (die *quaestiones* – N. K.) kommt daher einer gegen das

⁴⁴ Noch zwei Argumente dafür, dass Antonius ein *concilium plebis* vorgeschrieben hat, sind von uns nicht erwogen. Martin (1970, 76) nimmt Bleickens Theorie (o. S. 260–261) an, *provocatio* sei ursprünglich ein Hilferuf eines Plebeiers zu seinen Ständegenossen; dementsprechend nimmt Martin (1970, 86) an, die Berufung habe ihrer Natur gemäß zu einem *concilium plebis* geführt. Doch, wie oben gesagt wurde, mussten die Provokationsgesetze ein Verfahren vorgeschrieben haben, welches nicht unbedingt die Durchführung eines Plebiszits voraussetzte. Das zweite Argument gehört zu Lintott (1972, 239 f.): kein Volksgericht sei nach einer *quaestio* nötig. Dies ist nicht genug, um Durchführung eines Plebiszits statt des Volksgerichts anzunehmen.

⁴⁵ V. A. Mommsen 1887a, 110–112, vgl. Mommsen 1887b, 353; Mommsen 1899, 172 f.

⁴⁶ Nicht ganz konsequent nimmt er 1899, 153 Anm. 1 an, dass die Bacchanalienprozesse teilweise vor einem Volksgericht geführt worden sein könnten. Vgl. die eingehende Analyse der Mommsen'schen Stellungnahme: Kunkel 1962, 25–27.

⁴⁷ Bleicken 1959a, 367 f.

Volksgesicht selbst gleich“.⁴⁸ Seinen Ansichten nach war die Berufung gegen ein Quästionenurteil eine bahnbrechende Neuerung, da Bleicken die Provokation nur gegen Zwangsmittel (*coercitio*), nicht im Falle eines gerichtlichen Urteils, für möglich hält.⁴⁹ Dies wurde aber von ihm im Bezug auf die *lex Antonia* nicht formuliert.⁵⁰

So war die Berufung gegen ein Quästionenurteil vor 43 v. Chr. prinzipiell unmöglich, unabhängig davon, ob wir uns der Meinung Mommsens oder der Bleickens anschließen. Doch wurde Cic. *Phil.* I, 21–23 zu einem Argument gegen diese Annahme.

Bleicken glaubt, ein bloßer Hilferuf eines Plebeiers an seine Standesgenossen sei die Urform der *provocatio*. Sie sei nur für die Ständekämpfe belegt, und nach der gesetzlichen Anerkennung des Berufungsrechts *am Ende der Ständekämpfe* wurde die Provokation unnötig. Merkwürdigerweise wurde die Provokation jedoch noch im 2. Jh. v. Chr. in Fällen ausgeübt, welche von den Provokationsgesetzen kaum vorgesehen waren, nämlich in den Fällen einer pontificalen Strafe.⁵¹ Daraus folgert Bleicken, die Provokation habe auch in dieser Epoche nicht als ein Rechtsmittel, sondern als „der verzweifelte Versuch, eine Coercitionsstrafe von sich abzuwehren“⁵² funktioniert. Hinsichtlich der Philippikastelle zieht Bleicken daraus freilich keine Folgerungen. Für Lintott aber dient der Gedanke zur Begründung der Annahme, die Provokation habe neben der gesetzlich anerkannten Form (die Berufung an das Volk wurde von den Volkstribunen angenommen) auch in ihrer ursprünglicher Form des bloßen Hilferufs an alle anwesenden Bürger bis zum Ende der Republik immer noch existiert bzw. als möglich gegolten. Normalerweise werde auch eine solche Berufung von den Volkstribunen angenommen.⁵³ Die „gesetzliche“ Provokation sei von den Gesetzen, welche die

⁴⁸ Bleicken 1959b, 2456.

⁴⁹ Dies erhellt schon aus seiner Interpretation der die Provokation erwähnenden Belegstellen (Bleicken 1959a, 332–345) und ist in den Schlussfolgerungen (1959a, 348–351) ausdrücklich formuliert. Für Mommsen dagegen war die *provocatio* ein unentbehrlicher Teil des Volksgesichts. Die der Berufung unterliegenden Strafen wurden nur nach drei *contiones* verhängt, welche die Vorstufe eines Volksgesichts bilden (s. o. Anm. 20).

⁵⁰ Bleickens Versuch (1959a, 367 f.) zu zeigen, das Antonische Gesetz habe keine zweite Instanz in das Quästionengericht eingeführt, mag mit der prinzipiellen Unmöglichkeit der Berufung gegen ein Gerichtsurteil zusammenhängen, da die Provokation gegen jederlei Gericht eine zweite Instanz schaffen würde. Vgl. o. Anm. 10.

⁵¹ Bleicken 1959a, 342–345.

⁵² Bleicken 1959a, 359.

⁵³ V. A. Lintott 1972, 228; 238–246.

quaestiones perpetuae eingeführt hatten, verboten worden, wie auch jede andere Form der Interzession und Appellation.⁵⁴ Die „ursprüngliche“ Provokation habe sich keineswegs verbieten gelassen. Darum sollte sie auch im J. 43 grundsätzlich denkbar sein.⁵⁵ Dass die Provokation – wenigstens die „ursprüngliche“ – gegen beliebige Strafe möglich gewesen sei, erhelle daraus, dass Cicero in seiner Kritik an Antonius mit keinem Wort erwähnt, dass die *provocatio* im Falle eines gesetzlichen Urteils unmöglich war.⁵⁶ Das heiße, sie bleibe grundsätzlich möglich, obwohl ihre Annahme während eines Quästionenprozesses allen Magistraten offenbar verboten gewesen sei. Folglich habe Antonius die zu dieser Zeit bestehende Möglichkeit durch sein Gesetz anerkennen wollen: „Cicero... does not argue that it was inappropriate and unprecedented to use *provocatio* against a judicial sentence. Certainly, *provocatio* had not occurred against a decision by a *quaestio perpetua*, but this was not because it was illegitimate to appeal against sentence: appeal seems to have been rendered impractical by the *leges* and *plebiscita* which set up the courts in the first place“.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ E. g. *lex Tab. Bant.* 7–20 verbietet allen Magistraten, auf irgendwelche Weise den Vollzug des Gesetzes zu hemmen oder zu verhindern. Wie Lintott (1972, 256) ganz folgerichtig bemerkt, sind dergleichen Klauseln für die meisten späteren *leges iudicariae* anzunehmen und sind auch für die früheren Gesetze wenigstens wahrscheinlich. Für die frühen *quaestiones extraordinariae* hält Lintott beides, *appellatio et provocatio*, für nicht verboten, – wenigstens, für die *ex senatus consulto*. Dies scheint nicht begründet genug zu sein. Lintott (1972, 254 f.) führt zwei Fälle an, nämlich eine Provokation des Pleminius (Liv. XXIX, 19–22; vgl. Lintotts Interpretation des Prozesses: 1972, 241–243) und *appellatio* des P. Scipio Nasicus zugunsten des L. Scipio Asiaticus (Liv. XXXVIII, 54, 2–60). Doch ist in der Pleminiusaffäre keine *appellatio* sowie keine *provocatio* belegt, und es gibt keine Ursache, sie anzunehmen. Wie Lintott (1972, 242 f.) glaubt, haben die Volkstribune den Pleminius vor das Volk geführt (Liv. XXIX, 22, 7–8) weil er provoziert habe. Diese Annahme lässt außer Acht, dass die Tribune dabei dem *SC* hinsichtlich des Pleminius folgten: *Pleminium legatum uinctum Romam deportari placere et ex uinculis causam dicere ac, si uera forent quae Locrenses quererentur, in carcere necari bonaque eius publicari*. – „Der Legat Pleminius müsse gefesselt nach Rom abgeführt werden, und sich in Fesseln verantworten; und wenn die Klagen der Locrenser gegründet wären, müsse man ihn im Kerker hinrichten lassen und sein Vermögen einziehen“ (Liv. XXIX, 19, 5; übers. von Heusinger 1821, 548 mit unseren unerheblichen Veränderungen). Und was die Berufung des Scipio angeht, gesteht Lintott selbst zu, dass seine Appellation formell gegen Verhaftung des Scipio Asiaticus, nicht gegen das Urteil gerichtet war.

⁵⁵ Lintott 1972, 239 f.; 253–257.

⁵⁶ Bemerkt von Martin 1970, 77. Er zieht keine Schlussfolgerungen aus dieser Beobachtung und neigt dazu, dass Provokationen gegen Quästionenurteile nicht üblich waren.

⁵⁷ Lintott 1972, 239.

Dazu ist Folgendes zu bemerken. Lintott scheint zu glauben, dass, wenn die Provokation gegen ein gerichtliches Urteil unerhört wäre, würde Cicero dies gegen Antonius einwenden. Hätte Antonius selbst gegen ein Urteil provoziert, und hätte Cicero darüber geschwiegen, dann würde Lintott Recht haben. Doch geht es um ein *Gesetz*. Die meisten Gesetze führen etwas Neues ein. Wenn es auch keinen Präzedenzfall für die von Antonius geplante Berufungsmöglichkeit gab, so bedeutet das nur, dass das Antonische Gesetz etwas Neues beinhaltet hat. Es wäre sinnlos, das Gesetz deswegen zu tadeln, dass es etwas Neues vorschreibt, da die Veränderungen wünschenswert oder notwendig sein können. Cicero sagt über die Argumente des Antonius so gut wie nichts, doch mag der Letztere gewusst haben, sein Gesetz durch irgendwelche Notwendigkeit zu begründen. Die Kritik daran konnte nur darauf gegründet sein, welche schlimme Folgen das Gesetz haben würde. Dies ist praktisch das, was Cicero gemacht hat. Aus seinem Schweigen hinsichtlich der Beispiellostigkeit des Gesetzes ist nichts zu folgern. Die Quellen erwähnen manchmal, dass die *provocatio* einen *civis indemnatus* schützte.⁵⁸ Und Bleickens Analyse der belegten Präzedenzfälle⁵⁹ legt nahe, dass gerade die *coercitio* von dem Provokationsrecht begrenzt wurde. Selbstverständlich ist aus dem Mangel an Belege nicht zu folgern, dass die Berufung gegen jederlei Gerichtsurteil keineswegs möglich war.⁶⁰ Aber soweit es keine sicheren Fälle derartiger Provokation gibt, gibt es auch keinen Grund, sie anzunehmen.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Liv. III, 56, 13; Dion. Hal. VI, 58, 2; VII, 36, 3 (das Valerische Gesetz aus dem J. 509 v. Chr. lasse keinen Römer ohne Gericht getötet werden). Doch haben die Worte von Dionysius nicht viel Gewicht, da er mehrmals das Valerische Gesetz auf ziemlich rhetorische Weise interpretiert, vgl. VI, 58, 2 (Provokationsrecht für alle Plebeier, die einen Prozess gegen einen Patrizier verloren hatten); VII, 41, 1–3 (das Gesetz lasse einen Plebeier im Falle jeder nicht gerechtfertigten Tat eines Patriziers ein Volksgericht fördern).

⁵⁹ S. o. Anm. 49.

⁶⁰ Laut Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 16, 1 hat Tiberius Gracchus versprochen, die Berufung an das Volk gegen Gerichtsurteile einzuführen. Welche Gerichte dabei gemeint sind, ist nicht klar. Obwohl der Bericht ziemlich unglaublich ist, lässt er gewinnen, dass die Provokation gegen (irgendwelche) Gerichte zu dieser Zeit nicht üblich war. Zur Kritik der Plutarchstelle vgl. Kuznetsova 2019. Lintott (1972, 239) sieht in diesem Bericht einen Präzedenzfall für das Antonische Gesetz. Enthält der Bericht von Plutarch einen geschichtlichen Kern, dann konnte Antonius sich auf das Vorbild der Gracchen berufen. Die Tatsache bedeutet aber noch nicht, dass die Reform nicht radikal war.

⁶¹ Wir müssen zugestehen, dass es nicht sicher ist, ob das über den Rabirius gefällte Duumviralurteil (o. Anm. 33) als *coercitio* zu betrachten ist. Doch ist es mindestens wahrscheinlich. Vermutlich durften die Duumviren keinen Angeklagten freisprechen (Liv. I, 26, 7). Und Cicero (*Rab. Perd.* 12) charakterisiert das

4. Zusammenfassung

Wir fassen zusammen. Aus der ersten *Philippika* lässt sich hinsichtlich des Provokationsverfahrens sowie des Anwendungsbereichs der Provokation so gut wie nichts gewinnen. U.a., beweist der Text nicht, dass Antonius Durchführung eines Plebiszits als Berufungsverfahren vorgesehen hat. Folglich muss das Verfahren anhand anderer Quellen rekonstruiert werden. U.E. hat der Rabiriusprozess aus dem J. 63 v.Chr. entscheidende Bedeutung. Die Belege für diesen Prozess weisen auf ein Volksgericht hin. Die Frage, in welchen Fällen die Provokation als berechtigt galt, lässt sich nicht mit Sicherheit beantworten. Cicero sagt kein Wort darüber, ob die Berufung im Falle des Geschworenenurteils möglich war. Dies bedeutet aber noch nicht, dass sie als normal galt und dass Cicero diese Tatsache gerade deswegen außer Acht gelassen hat, weil er sie dem Antonius nicht vorwerfen konnte. Umgekehrt, liegt es nahe, dass die Berufung nur gegen Zwangsmaßnahmen anerkannt war, da sie nur für derartige Fälle sicher belegt ist. Doch ist Vieles davon abhängig, wie die Fälle einer Berufung gegen die pontifikale Geldstrafe zu rekonstruieren sind: ob die Berufung sich auf irgendwelche Weise durch die Provokationsgesetze begründen ließ, und welches Verfahren durch die Berufung in Gang gesetzt wurde.

Natalia Kuznetsova
*Institut für linguistische Forschungen
 der Russischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
 ku02@yandex.ru*

Duumviralverfahren als einen Versuch, Rabirius *indicta causa* – praktisch ohne Gerichtsuntersuchung – zu töten. Diese Worte können sich auf Unmöglichkeit eines Freispruchs beziehen (so z.B. Mommsen 1899, 155 Anm. 1), doch liegt es nahe, dass vor dem Urteilsspruch keine öffentliche Untersuchung stattgefunden hatte (so z.B. Tyrrell 1978, 87 und Lintott 1972, 261 Anm. 185). Weiter waren die *duumviri* weder auf Grund einer Volksentscheidung bestellt (Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 12 *iniussu vestro*) noch vom Volke selbst für den konkreten Fall des Rabirius gewählt (Cass. Dio XXXVII, 27, 2). Insgesamt lassen diese Umstände nicht an ein Gericht, sondern eher an eine vom Volke nicht sanktionierte Kapitalkoerzition denken. Daraus erhellt sich, dass das Duumviralverfahren dem Mommsen'schen Schema des Volksgerichts nicht entspricht, da Mommsen glaubte, dass jedes der Berufung unterliegende Urteil nur nach der öffentlichen Untersuchung (die Cic. *Dom.* 45 erwähnten *contiones*) gefällt werden durfte (o. Anm. 20); dieser Spruch, *iudicatio*, galt seinen Ansichten nach als vollwertiges Urteil. Dass die oben genannten Stellen dieser Interpretation widersprechen, sah Mommsen; er hat verschiedene Lösungen dieses Problems vorgeschlagen: Mommsen 1887a, 617 Anm 5; 1887b, 354 Anm. 6; 355 Anm. 1; 1899, 155 Anm. 1. – Für die angeführten Erwägungen sind wir Herrn Prof. em. Dr. Dr. h. c. J. von Ungern-Sternberg herzlich dankbar.

Bibliographie

- C. Bailey (Hg., Übers., Komm. und Einl.), *T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura libri sex* II²: *Commentary, Books I–III* (Oxford 1950).
- J. Bleicken, “Kollisionen zwischen Sacrum und Publicum: Eine Studie zum Verfall der Altrömischen Religion”, *Hermes* 85: 4 (1957) 446–480.
- J. Bleicken, “Ursprung und Bedeutung der Provocation”, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung* 76 (1959a) 324–377.
- J. Bleicken, “Provocatio”, *RE* 23 (1959b), 2444–2463.
- A. Boulanger, P. Wuilleumier (Hg. und Übers.), *Cicéron. Discours. Vol. XIX: Philippiques I à IV* (Paris 1972).
- T. C. Brennan, *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic* (Oxford 2000).
- J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy. Books 34–37* (Oxford 1981).
- T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic I: 509 B.C. – 100 B.C.* (New York 1951).
- T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic II: 99 B.C. – 31 B.C.* (New York 1952).
- A. C. Clark (Hg.), *Marci Tulli Ciceronis Orationes Pro Milone, Pro Marcello, Pro Ligario, Pro Rege Deiotaro, Philippicae I–XIV* (Oxford 1918).
- M. H. Crawford (Hg.), *Roman Statutes* II, *Bulletin of Classical Studies Supplement* 64 (London 1996).
- J. D. Denniston (Hg., Komm. und Einl.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis In M. Antonium orationes Philippicae prima et secunda* (Oxford 1926).
- A. R. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus* (Ann Arbor 2007).
- P. Fedeli (Hg.), *Ciceronis In M. Antonium orationes Philippicae XIV* (Leipzig 1982).
- P. Flury, “Opera”, *TLL* IX.2 (1976) 659–669.
- M. E. Grabar’-Passek (Hg.), V. O. Gorenshtein (Übers. und Komm.), *Cicéron. Rechi v dvukh tomakh* II: *Gody 62–43 do n. e. [Cicero. Die Reden. In 2 Bänden II: 62–43 v. Chr.]* (Moskau 1962).
- K. Heusinger (Übers.), *Titus Livius. Römische Geschichte* III (Braunschweig 1821).
- W. C. A. Ker (Übers.), *Cicero. Philippics*, *Loeb Classical Library* XV (London 1995).
- R. Kühner, C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Teil II. Satzlehre* I⁴ (Darmstadt 1971).
- W. Kunkel, *Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung des römischen Kriminalverfahrens in vorsullanischer Zeit*, *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Abhandlungen. Neue Folge* 56 (München 1962).
- W. Kunkel, “Quaestio 1”, *RE* 24 (1963) 720–786.
- N. Kuznetsova, “Provocatio gegen das Urteil der duumviri perduellionis”, *Hyperboreus* 23: 2 (2017) 276–301.
- N. Kuznetsova, “Plut. Ti. Gracch. 16, 1: a Gracchan Law on Appeal?”, *Philologia Classica* 14: 1 (2019) 56–67.
- A. W. Lintott, “Provocatio. From the Struggle of the Orders to the Principate”, *ANRW* 1: 2 (1972) 226–267.

- C. S. Mackay, *The Judicial Legislation of Gaius Sempronius Gracchus*, Diss. (Harvard 1994).
- G. Manuwald (Hg., Übers. und Komm.), *Cicero. Philippics 3–9. II. Commentary*, Texte und Kommentare: eine alttumswissenschaftliche Reihe 30/1 (Berlin 2007).
- J. Martin, “Die Provokation in der Klassischen und Späten Republik”, *Hermes* 98: 1 (1970) 72–96.
- Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* II. 1³ (Leipzig 1887).
- Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* III. 1³ (Leipzig 1887).
- Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht* (Leipzig 1899).
- A. H. D. Munro (Hg., Übers. und Komm.), E. N. da C. Anrade (Einl.), *T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura libri sex II⁴: Explanatory Notes* (London–Cambridge 1928).
- R. Nickel (Hg. und Einl.), M. Fuhrmann (Übers.), *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Die Philippischen Reden. Lateinisch–Deutsch* (Berlin 2013).
- R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1–5* (Oxford 1965).
- J. T. Ramsey (Hg. und Komm.), *Cicero. Philippics I–II* (Cambridge 2003).
- J. T. Ramsey, “Mark Antony’s Judiciary Reform and Its Revival under the Triumvirs”, *JRS* 95 (2005) 20–37.
- G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani. Elenco cronologico con una introduzione sull’attività legislativa dei comizi romani* (Milano 1912).
- K. Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies: A Study of Legislative Practice in Republican Rome*, Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 24 (Rome 2001).
- D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Hg. und Übers.), *Cicero. Philippics* (Chapel Hill 1986).
- L. R. Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies: From the Hannibalic War to the Dictatorship of Caesar* (Ann Arbor 2003).
- L. Thommen, *Das Volkstribunat der späten Römischen Republik*, *Historia: Einzelschriften* 59 (Stuttgart 1989).
- F. Tietze, “Manere”, *TLL* 8 (1937) 280–293.
- W. B. Tyrrell, *A Legal and Historical Commentary to Cicero’s Oratio pro C. Rabirio perduellionis reo* (Amsterdam 1978).
- Ch. Wirszubsky, *Libertas As a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate* (Cambridge 1968).

Cic. *Phil.* I, 21–23 is the only source for the Antonian bill of 43 BC, which may have allowed the appeal to the people (*provocatio*) against the condemnation *de vi et maiestatis* by the jury courts. This bill is practically the only law on the appeal which dates to a relatively well-attested period and offers contemporary evidence. This sounds like a good chance to answer at least some of the many questions concerning the right of appeal to the people. The paper aims at two points: (1) what procedure for the appeal is attested by the *Philippic*?; (2) was the appeal against any court allowed or at least considerable *before* the Antonian bill?

Unfortunately, Cicero does not give any reliable information concerning both questions. There were attempts to base some hypotheses on his criticism of the

Antonian bill, but no arguments set out for their support turn out to be convincing. Hence the answers to both questions are to be based on other evidence concerning *provocatio*. Much depends on the texts which allow different interpretations and require careful explanation, but as far as can be said at present, (1) the *provocatio* may normally have led to a comitial court; (2) before the Antonian bill the appeal may have been appropriate only in case of an out-of-court punishment, and the reform Antonius proposed may have been unprecedented.

Cic. *Phil.* I, 21–23 – единственный источник, касающийся предложенного Антонием в 43 г. до н. э. законопроекта, введившего апелляцию к народу (*provocatio*) на приговоры *quaestiones de vi et maiestatis*. Это редкий случай, когда закон о провокации описан в современном ему тексте, к тому же относящемуся к сравнительно достоверной эпохе. Поэтому разбираемый пассаж мог бы послужить надежной отправной точкой в исследовании вызывающего множество споров права провокации. Ставится два вопроса: (1) какие этот текст содержит указания на процедуру рассмотрения провокации в народном собрании; (2) какие он позволяет сделать выводы о границах применения этого права до Антониева закона: была ли провокация на приговоры суда сложившейся или хотя бы теоретически допустимой практикой, или Антоний предложил принципиальное новшество.

Ни на один из этих вопросов текст *Филиппики* ответа не дает. Известные нам попытки найти в нем какие-либо указания на этот счет не дали убедительных результатов. Т. о., оба поставленных вопроса приходится решать на основании других источников. Баланс свидетельств скорее в пользу того, что (1) провокация рассматривалась комициальным судом; (2) провокация была допустима только в случае наказаний, назначенных *без* суда, и Антониев закон вводил довольно радикальное новшество. Однако здесь многое зависит от интерпретации свидетельств, на данный момент не имеющих однозначного истолкования.

Boris Hogenmüller

AMEANA (?) PUELLA DEFUTUTA.
TEXTKRITISCHE ÜBERLEGUNG ZU CAT. C. 41

Hinführung

Catulls Gedichte, die auch heute noch klassisch in drei Gruppen unterteilt werden,¹ bestechen durch ihre Vielzahl an Metren wie auch Themen. Neben z.B. den Gedichten des Lesbia-Zyklus,² den Hochzeitsgedichten (c. 61 und c. 62) und den *carmina maiora* des sogenannten ‚Mittelbaus‘ (c. 63 bis 68) sind gerade die zahlreichen Invektiven von besonderer Qualität. Verfasst gegen Zeitgenossen aller sozialen Schichten, finden sich in ihnen nicht selten boshafte und durchaus obszöne Angriffe gegen gleichrangige, aber auch gegen höhergestellte Personen der politischen Öffentlichkeit. Insbesondere Cäsar (c. 29; c. 43; c. 57) und Pompeius (c. 29; c. 113) – und mit ihnen verbunden deren Sympathisanten – forderten den Veroneser zur Abfassung harscher Polemik heraus, die nicht selten auch das weitere Umfeld der beiden prominentesten Persönlichkeiten der ausgehenden Republik betraf. Dabei verband Catull auf kunstvolle Weise die Invektiven auf beide Politiker mit anderen Themenzyklen (u.a. den Gedichten auf die *puella* Lesbia) seines *libellus*.

Bisweilen jedoch bleibt trotz aller Klarheit der intratextuellen Bezüge das richtige Verständnis bestimmter Passagen weiterhin im Dunkeln. Häufig³ ist dieses Phänomen auf den unzureichend geklärten Textzustand zurückzuführen, der sich aus der fehlerhaften Überlieferung in den Handschriften ergibt und selten verbessert werden kann. Eine solche dubiose Passage liegt nach Ansicht der Forschung in c. 41 vor, in welchem eine Korruptele des Textes den Zugang zu einem Textverständnis im Sinne Catulls letztlich unklar macht.

¹ Vgl. u. a. Syndikus 1984, I, 62–70; Haig Gaisser 2009, 29–50, bes. 36; Hartz 2012, 57.

² Vgl. dazu Syndikus 1984, I, 17–33.

³ So in c. 11, 11; c. 21, 11; c. 25, 5; c. 29, 21; c. 66, 15; c. 68, 157; c. 95, 3.

C. 41 im Spiegel der Forschung

†a me an a† puella defututa
 tota milia me decem poposcit,
 ista turpiculo puella naso,
 decoctoris amica Formiani.
 propinqui, quibus est puella curae,
 amicos medicosque convocate:
 non est sana puella, nec rogare
 qualis sit solet aes imaginisum.

Bei diesem kurzen Gedicht, das unter Nr. 41 geführt wird, handelt es sich um eine in Hendekasyllaben abgefasste Invektive auf die ‚Freundin‘ (*amica*) eines als ‚Verschwender aus Formiae‘ (*decoctor Formianus*) bezeichneten Mannes. Diese soll es gewagt haben, vom Dichter die horrenden Summe von 10 000 Sesterzen (*tota milia decem*) einzufordern, was Catull dazu veranlasst hat, ihren Geisteszustand (*non est sana*) und ihre Selbstwahrnehmung (*qualis sit*) zu hinterfragen.

Der *decoctor Formianus* wird nach Auffassung der meisten Gelehrten als jener aus Formiae stammende und unter Cäsar in Gallien dienende *magister fabrum* [Marcus Vitruvius⁴] Marmurra⁵ identifiziert. Ihn hat Catull auch an anderer Stelle mehrfach⁶ verhöhnt und abschätzig als Liebhaber dieser *puella* bezeichnet.

Die Dame wird heute aus sprachlichen Aspekten – in beiden Gedichten wird sie bekanntermaßen als *amica decoctoris Formiani* bezeichnet – und inhaltlichen Parallelen – es findet sich zweimal der Verweis auf ihr äußeres Erscheinungsbild – mit jener *puella* gleichgesetzt, die in c. 43 aufgrund ihres ‚hässlichen‘ Äußeren von Catull verhöhnt wird. Folglich wird angenommen, in den Gedichten c. 41 und 43, möglicherweise sogar unter Einbezug von c. 42, eine in sich abgeschlossene Einheit zu erkennen, die unter dem Begriff *Ameana*-Zyklus vermerkt wird.⁷ Eine solche eindeutige Kennzeichnung jedoch ist mit einer gewissen Skepsis zu betrachten, da der Name *Ameana* und damit die gerne bemühte Identifikation⁸ der *puella* kaum verifiziert werden kann.

⁴ Vgl. dazu die Annahme von Thielscher 1961, 427–489. Anders vgl. Ruffel-Soubiron 1962, 123–179.

⁵ Vgl. McDermott 1977, 292–307.

⁶ Vgl. u. a. c. 29; c. 57; c. 93; c. 94; c. 114; c. 115.

⁷ Vgl. Forsythe 1977, 445–450.

⁸ Bährens 1876, ad loc. und Ellis 1904, ad loc. halten sie für eine Veroneserin; skeptisch hingegen Syndikus 1984, I, 224.

Die Korruptele *†a me an a †*

Ein Blick in die beiden ältesten, für dieses Gedicht relevanten Hss. zeigt sehr deutlich, dass im ersten Vers von c. 41 zu Beginn eine Korruptele vorliegt. Sowohl der Oxforder *Canonicianus* Class. Lat. 30 (O) aus dem 14. Jh. (*a mean · a · puella defututa*) als auch der ursprünglich in Verona im Jahr 1375 entstandene und sich heute in der Bibliothèque Nationale de France befindliche *Parisinus* Lat. 14137 (G) (*ame an apuella defututa*) weisen in den ersten vier Silben des Hendekasyllabus eine verderbte Stelle auf. Während aus O und G darauf geschlossen werden kann, dass die erste Silbe mit dem Vokal *A* begonnen hat, divergieren die beiden Hss. im weiteren Verlauf. O weist im Gegensatz zu G nach *mean* eine Lücke auf, gefolgt von *a* und einer weiteren Lücke im Umfang von einem Buchstaben oder einer Silbe.⁹ G zeigt diese Lücke nicht, zieht jedoch das *a* zu dem anlautenden *p* hinzu und schreibt explizit *apuella*.

Der folglich unsichere Textzustand hat seit der Wiederentdeckung der Gedichte im 15. Jahrhundert die Herausgeber und Kommentatoren der *Catulli carmina* zu verschiedenen Konjekturen veranlasst.¹⁰ Nach Sichtung der Forschungsliteratur gerade der letzten 200 Jahre zeigt sich, dass die Korruptele möglicherweise den Namen oder eine nähere Bezeichnung der Freundin des Mamurra enthalten hat. Dementsprechend zahlreich sind die Vorschläge, diese Stelle wiederherzustellen (u.a. *Ammiana* Froehner 1858, 148; *Aufilena* Pohl 1860, 42; *Ametina* Haupt 1861, ad loc.; *Arretina* Peiper 1875, 28; *Amiana* Macnaghten–Ramsay 1899, 108; *Aminaea* Friedrich 1908, ad loc.; *Amiana* Schmid 1974, 17; *Ammeana* D’Anna 1994, 47–52) wobei in meinen Augen jedoch kein zufriedenstellendes Ergebnis erzielt werden konnte, das gerade der inneren Kohärenz der drei Gedichte gerecht wird.

Obgleich in der Vielzahl der modernen Ausgaben – u.a. in der *Oxoniensis* von R. A. B. Mynors (³1967), der von H. Bardon besorgten *Teubneriana* (1973) und der von G. P. Goold herausgegebenen *Loeb* Ausgabe (²1989) – *Ameana* zu finden ist, weist C. J. Fordyce (²1973, 191) in seinem Kommentar zu c. 41 auf die dieser Konjektur zugrunde liegende Problematik hin: „*Ameana*: the manuscripts agree on these letters, but the name, if it is a name, has not been convincingly explained“.

⁹ Die weiteren späteren Textzeugen sind meines Erachtens nicht näher zu betrachten, da sie keine Verbesserungsansätze bieten können.

¹⁰ Eine Auflistung der unterschiedlichen Varianten ist auf der von Dániel Kiss gepflegten Homepage www.catullusonline.org zu c. 41 ad 1 zu finden.

Ameana, das Mädchen aus der Provinz (?)

In c. 41 ist zu lesen, dass es sich bei der von Catull geschmähten *puella* um die (oder eine) *amica* des Mamurra, jenes Verschwenders aus Formiae (*decoctoris Formiani*), wie Catull ihn bezeichnet, handelt. Aus c. 41, 42 und 43 ist zudem zu erfahren, dass die Dame möglicherweise aus einer Provinz stammte oder dort lebte (c. 43, 6: *ten provincia narrat esse bellam?*) und einen recht zweifelhaften Ruf besaß, ‚verlangte‘ sie doch in c. 41, 2 von Catull eine geradezu horrende Summe von 10000 Sesterzen. Aus semantischen Gründen liegt die Vermutung nahe, dass Catull die geforderten Sesterze für bereits geleistete Liebesdienste¹¹ bezahlen sollte. Aus der Höhe der Forderung – die umgerechnet in etwa 1840 Euro entspräche – ist zu schließen, dass es sich bei der *amica* des Mamurra vermeintlich um eine *meretrix*, eine Edelprostituierte, gehandelt haben könnte. Diese Klasse von Prostituierten unterschied sich von den gewöhnlichen Huren dahingehend, dass sie den Anforderungen an ihren Berufsstand gemäß gebildet und kultiviert zu sein hatten.¹²

In Catulls eigener Wahrnehmung ist diese *puella* jedoch keineswegs eine *meretrix*. Nicht anders ist die mehrfache metaphorische Diffamierung der Dame als *puella defututa* (c. 41, 1), *moecha turpis* (c. 42, 3), *moecha putida* (c. 42, 11 und 19), *lutum* und *lupanar* (c. 42, 13) zu verstehen, womit sie äußerst pejorativ und obszön den gewöhnlichen Prostituierten zugeordnet wird, die gemeinhin als *scorta* bzw. *lupae* bezeichnet wurden und ihren Dienst häufig auf den Straßen verrichteten.¹³

Trotz der offensichtlichen Hinweise scheint es verwunderlich, dass Catull, der ansonsten den prägnanten Ausdruck wenig scheut, an dieser Stelle darauf verzichtet und dem Mädchen beim Namen genannt haben soll. Überblickt man das gesamte Corpus der *Catulli carmina* synoptisch, fällt auf, dass Frauen, die zum Ziel des Spottes geworden sind, nicht durchgängig bei ihren Namen genannt werden und zum Teil anonym bleiben.¹⁴ Die Annahme, dass Catull die *puella* des Mamurra

¹¹ Vgl. dazu Syndikus 1984, I, 224 mit Verweis auf die Parallele in *AP* V, 121, 4 (*poscere* für *αἰτεῖν* im Sinne der Forderung der Entlohnung für Liebesdienste).

¹² Dieser Schluss wird durch die metaphorische Bezeichnung *lupanar* verstärkt, worunter gemeinhin die Wohnstatt einer *meretrix* (*TLL* s. v. *lupanar* 1846: „[...] *habitatione meretricis* [...]“) zu verstehen ist.

¹³ In c. 58 setzt Catull Lesbia mit einer solchen Straßenhure gleich, die in den Gassen Roms ihre Freier bedient (*nunc in quadriuis et angiportis / glubit magnanimos Remi nepotes*), vgl. Syndikus 1984, I, 279–282.

¹⁴ Es finden sich insgesamt vier Gedichte, in denen Frauen namentlich verspottet werden (c. 59: Rufa; c. 86: Quintia; c. 110 und 111: Aufilena). Demgegenüber stehen Gedichte (c. 42; c. 43; c. 88; c. 89; c. 90, in denen keine Namen genannt werden.

im Eingangsvers bei ihrem Namen genannt hat, scheint mir gerade vor dem kontextuellen Hintergrund, dass die *amica* des Mamurra gerade auch in c. 42 und c. 43 ebenfalls angesprochen, aber nicht namentlich erwähnt wird, nicht zwingend notwendig. Für deutlich plausibler halte ich es, dass Catull die *puella* konkret mit einem Substantiv verspottet hat, das sie eindeutig dem Rotlichtmilieu bzw. dem Milieu der käuflichen Liebe zuordnen konnte.

Aus der metrischen Gestaltung des Gedichts geht hervor, dass die Korruptele an dieser Stelle mit der für den Hendekasyllabus geforderten Silbenquantität [$\times \times - \cup$] wohl ein Substantiv oder Adjektiv fordert, das mit dem Vokal *A* beginnt, in der *syllaba paenultima* eine lange Silbe postuliert und auf ein kurzes auslautendes *A* endet. Die, wie bereits erwähnt, in den Hss. tradierten Konsonanten bzw. Vokale *M*, *E*, *A* und *N* der zweiten und dritten Silbe sind meiner Ansicht nach nicht als vollkommen sicher zu bewerten, lassen sie doch aufgrund ähnlicher Strichführung insbesondere in der Schulter und den Bögen sehr leicht eine Verwechslung bzw. Verlesung bei der Transkription zunächst von der Majuskel- in die Minuskelhandschrift, besonders aber gerade bei weiteren Abschriften und Übertragung in der Minuskelhandschrift zu.

Den beiden ältesten, heute noch erhaltenen Handschriften nach – dem Oxforder Canonicianus Class. Lat. 30 (ca. 14. Jh.) und dem Parisinus lat. 14137 (ca. 1375) – sind der Leitbuchstabe *a* korrekt überliefert und auch der erste Buchstabe der zweiten Silbe – *m* – wohl richtig wiedergegeben worden.¹⁵ Ebenfalls eindeutig erscheint der letzte Buchstabe *a*. In der vorletzten Silbe *an* jedoch sehe ich eine erste Verlesung, bedingt durch ähnliche Bogenführung der Buchstaben *n* und *i*, und konjiziere *ii* anstelle von *n*.¹⁶ Dies scheint nachvollziehbar, zumal intervokalisches *i* häufig als *ii* geschrieben wurde. Daraus ergibt sich nach meinem Dafürhalten *ame aii* bzw. *ame aija*. Aus den beiden genannten Hss. geht zudem hervor, dass vor der Silbe *an* ein Spatium (O) bzw. eine unleserliche Stelle (G) vorliegt, welcher der Vokal *e* vorausgeht. Diesen Vokal halte ich ebenfalls

Allerdings ist bei den namentlich genannten Damen u.a. nicht geklärt, ob es sich um lebende Personen oder fiktive Charaktere handelt, die Catull als *obiectum comparationis* für Lesbia gedient haben, vgl. u.a. Syndikus 1984, I, 285–286.

¹⁵ Letzte Zweifel können jedoch nicht ausgeräumt werden, da auch unbedenklich erscheinende Gedichtanfänge innerhalb des *corpus Catullianum* bisweilen fehlerhaft überliefert waren und emendiert werden mussten. Beispielhaft seien c. 13, 1 (*Enabis* in O anstelle *Cenabis*) und c. 16, 1 (*Dedicabo* in O statt *Pedicabo*) genannt.

¹⁶ Die Verwechslung von Buchstaben mit ähnlicher Strichführung (*i*, *m*, *n*, *u*) ist in der Minuskelhandschrift sehr häufig. Besonders prominent ist die Vertauschung von *u* und offenem *a* wie auch von *b* und *u*. Zu den verschiedenen Fehlern mit Beispielen und weiterführender Literatur vgl. Delz 1997, 61–70.

für eine Falschlesung, deren Genese möglicherweise bereits in der Abschrift der Unziale zu sehen ist. Dabei ist der ursprüngliche Konsonant *B* fälschlich zu dem Vokal *E* geworden, der bei der Überführung in die Minuskelschrift beibehalten wurde.¹⁷ Nicht auszuschließen ist auch, dass der Fehler erst in der Abschrift der Minuskelhandschrift entstanden ist.¹⁸ Aufgrund dieser Überlegung vermute ich anstelle *e* den meines Erachtens richtigen Konsonanten *b*, woraus sich *amb aiii* ergibt.

Das Spatium zwischen den Silben *me* (bzw. *mb*) und *an* (bzw. *aii/aij*) scheint meines Erachtens durch Auslassen eines in der Strichführung sehr ähnlich gestalteten *u* und *b* entstanden zu sein, möglicherweise, um eine zu Unrecht angenommene Dittographie (*mb* und *ub*) zu verbessern. Ich konjiziere aufgrund dieser Überlegungen nach dem Leitbuchstaben *A* und dem folgenden *m* zunächst *b* anstelle von *e*, gefolgt von der Buchstabenkombination *ub* im Spatium. Dem zufolge halte ich es für denkbar, dass statt des falschen Eigennamens *ameana* das Substantiv *ambubaia* bzw. *ambubaia* konjiziert werden muss.

Setzt man dieses an die verderbte erste Stelle des Verses ein, wird aus der Wendung *ameana puella defututa* – Ameana, das (sexuell) verbrauchte Mädchen – die deutlich obszönere und damit passendere Bezeichnung *ambubaia puella defututa* – eine Ambubaia, ein (sexuell) verbrauchtes bzw. viel benutztes Mädchen. Dies führt meiner Überzeugung nach nicht allein zu einer Verbesserung des Textzustandes, sondern insbesondere zu einer Korrektur des textimmanenten Verständnisses, das den kontextuellen Zusammenhang mit der in Vers 3 geforderten Summe der *puella* zu füllen scheint.

Der Begriff *ambubaia*¹⁹ ist ursprünglich dem syrischen Nomen *abbub* (Flöte) entlehnt und bezeichnet zunächst recht neutral eine (syrische) Flötenspielerin. In der lateinischen Literatur wird das Substantiv an verschiedenen Stellen zur Kennzeichnung einer Dame aus der ‚Unterhaltungsbranche‘ verwendet (Hor. *Sat.* I, 2, 1; Suet. *Nero* 27, 2; Petr. 74, 3, auch Hor. *Epist.* I, 14, 25: *meretrix tibicina*). Aus einem Eintrag des Porphyrios zu Hor. *Sat.* I, 2, 1 geht hervor, dass man unter dem genannten Begriff *mulieres vagae et viles* subsummierte, was diese dem Bereich

¹⁷ Die exakte Fehlergenese zu erschließen, dürfte kaum möglich sein. Hierzu schreibt Josef Delz (1997, 61) sehr überzeugend: „Die häufigste Ursache von Fehlern liegt darin, daß ein Kopist mit dem Schriftcharakter seiner Vorlage nicht vertraut war. Die Möglichkeiten für Buchstabenverwechslung sind unendlich“.

¹⁸ Dass *b* bisweilen falsch gelesen und stattdessen ein Vokal geschrieben wurde, zeigt sich in c. 5. Dort lautet in v. 11 die Verbform korrekt *conturbabimus*, in O und G jedoch ist das falsche *conturbauimus* zu finden.

¹⁹ Vgl. *TLL* s. v. *ambubaia* 1868.

der käuflichen Liebe in der Art von Hostessen zuordnet – ohne jedoch letztlich im eigentlichen Sinn Prostituierte zu sein²⁰ –, die sich neben ihren musikalischen Darbietungen für weitere Liebesdienste bezahlen ließen.²¹

Interessant ist zudem die kontextuelle Erwähnung der *ambubaia* in Horaz (*Sat.* I, 2), worin der Dichter die goldene Mitte zwischen Geiz und Verschwendung anrät. Explizit wird dort zu Beginn der Satire gesagt, dass über den Tod des Sängers Tigellius ganze Scharen von Ambubaiern tief betrübt gewesen wären (v. 1–3: *ambubaiarum collegia ... hoc genus omne maestum ac sollicitum est cantoris morte Tigelli*), da dieser so freigiebig gewesen sei (v. 4: *quippe benignus erat*). Tigellius' *benignitas* gegenüber den *ambubaiae*, die sicher eine euphemistische Umschreibung von *luxuria* darstellt, bildet meines Erachtens einen aufschlussreichen intertextuellen Konnex zu Mamurras eigener Verschwendungssucht, die durch die Finanzierung einer ebensolchen *ambubaia*²² mitunter ein Grund für seinen Bankrott gewesen sein könnte.²³

Zudem wird der Eindruck, dass die von Catull geschmähte Dame eindeutig aus dem Milieu des käuflichen Amusements entstammte, durch ihre explizite Bezeichnung als *amica* noch verstärkt. Aus dem Eintrag im TLL s. v. *amicus* 1912 geht hervor, dass in der (erotischen) Dichtung mit der Metapher *amica* nicht selten die konkreten Substantive *concupina*, *scortum* und *paelex* zur Bezeichnung einer ‚käuflichen‘ Frau bzw. Prostituierten verborgen werden. Diese semantische Konnotation von *amica* klingt bei Catull sowohl in c. 41, 4 zur Charakteristik der ‚Freundin‘ des Mamurra als auch mit Einschränkungen in c. 72, 3 zur Bezeichnung von Lesbia an.²⁴

Die Annahme, dass die geschmähte *puella* zudem dem provinziellen, dem primitiven²⁵ und damit dem nicht-urbanen Milieu entstammt haben könnte, unterstützt meines Erachtens ihre Herabwürdigung als plumpe, rustikale und ungebildete ‚Schönheit‘, deren „wenig erbaulicher Anblick durch den Mangel an Eleganz und Bildung noch trostloser“²⁶ erscheint, gerade vor dem Hintergrund der Abgrenzung von der von Catull gepriesenen Lesbia (c. 43, 7: *tecum Lesbia nostra comparatur?*).

²⁰ Vgl. dazu Adams 1982, 341–342.

²¹ Vgl. Herter 1960, 70–111.

²² Obgleich das Substantiv *ambubaia*, wie gezeigt wurde, syrischen Ursprung ist, musste Mamurras *puella* nicht zwangsläufig von dort stammen. Für wahrscheinlicher halte ich die Möglichkeit, dass hier grundsätzlich auf den Lebenswandel der Dame und ihren niedrigen bzw. zweifelhaften Status angespielt werden soll.

²³ Mamurras Vergeudung des väterlichen Vermögens wird in c. 29, 17 thematisiert.

²⁴ Vgl. dazu die Interpretation von Syndikus 1984, III, 10–11.

²⁵ Darin erkennt H.-P. Syndikus (1984, I, 231) den „Gipfel von Unverstand und Plumpheit“.

²⁶ *Ebd.*

Mamurras *amica*, die sich wie eine *meretrix* gebärdet, doch von Catull als *ambubaia* enttarnt und *amica* verhöhnt wird, stellt somit letztlich das *obiectum comparationis* zu Catulls eigener *puella* Lesbia dar – der in den Augen des Dichters weltgewandten, eleganten und urbanen *femme fatale* aus der Hauptstadt.

Zusammenfassung

Ausgehend von den genannten inhaltlichen wie auch syntaktisch-metrischen Überlegungen halte ich es für sehr wahrscheinlich, entgegen der Ansichten zahlreicher Gelehrter in der Korruptele von c. 41, 1 nicht den Namen bzw. einen Hinweis auf die Abstammung der *puella* des Mamurra zu sehen, sondern viel eher an dieser Stelle deren konkrete Bezeichnung als Dame des Rotlichtmilieus anzunehmen. Demzufolge spreche ich mich für die Konjektur *ambubaia* als Textverbesserung aus, um sowohl Mamurras *puella* als auch Mamurra selbst in aller Härte zu diffamieren und in höhnischer Weise zu verspotten, und gegen den Versuch, den nicht weiter belegten Eigennamen *Ameana* künstlich aufrechtzuerhalten.

Boris Hogenmüller

Würzburg

boris.hogenmueller@gmail.com

Bibliographie

- J. N. Adams, “Words for ‘Prostitute’ in Latin”, *RhM* 126: 3–4 (1982) 321–358.
 A. Bährens (Hg.), *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig 1876).
 H. Bardon (Hg.), *Catullus Veronensis. Carmina*, Bibliotheca Teubneriana (Berlin 1973).
 G. D’Anna, “La concezione etica dell’ultimo Catullo”, in: N. Criniti (Hg.), *Catullo e Sirmione. Società e cultura della Cisalpina alle soglie dell’impero* (Brescia 1994) 47–52.
 F. Della Corte, *Catullo. Le Poesie* (Mailand 1977).
 J. Delz, “Textkritik und Editionstechnik“, in: F. Graf (Hg.), *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie* (Stuttgart 1997) 51–73.
 R. Ellis (Hg.), *Catulli carmina* (Oxford 1904).
 C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus* (Oxford 21973).
 P. Y. Forsythe, “The Ameana Cycle of Catullus”, *CW* 70 (1977) 445–450.
 G. Friedrich, *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig–Berlin 1908).
 W. Froehner, “Zu Catull”, *RhM* 13 (1858) 147–150.
 G. P. Goold (Hg.), *Catullus. Edited with introduction, translation and commentary* (London 21989).

- J. Haig Gaisser, *Catull. Dichter der Leidenschaft* (Darmstadt 2012).
- C. Harz, *Catulls Epigramme im Kontext hellenistischer Dichtung* (Berlin – New York 2007).
- C. Hartz, *Römische Schriftsteller* (Mainz 2012).
- M. Haupt, *Catulli Tibulli Propertii carmina a Mauritio Hauptio iterum recognita* (Leipzig ²1861).
- H. Herter, “Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums”, *JbAC* 3 (1960) 70–111.
- H. V. Macnaghten, A. B. Ramsay (Hgg.), *Poems of Catullus* (London 1899).
- W. C. McDermott, “Mamurra, eques Formianus”, *RhM* 77 (1977) 292–307.
- R. A. B. Mynors (Hg.), *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Oxford Classical Texts (Oxford 1958).
- R. Peiper, *Q. Valerius Catullus. Beiträge zur Kritik seiner Gedichte* (Breslau 1875).
- J. Pohl, *Lectionum Catullianarum Specimen*, Diss. München (Euskirchen 1860).
- P. Rüffel, J. Soubiron (Hgg.), “Vitruve ou Mamurra?”, *Pallas* 11 (1962) 123–179.
- W. Schmid, *Catullus. Ansichten und Durchblicke* (Göppingen 1974).
- H.-P. Syndikus, *Catull. Eine Interpretation I–III* (Darmstadt 1984 [bibliographisch aktualisierte Aufl. ⁴2014]).
- L. Schwabe (Hg.), *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Gießen 1866).
- Thesaurus linguae latinae*, editus iussu et auctoritate consilii ab academiarum quinque germanicarum Berolinensis Gottingensis Lipsiensis Monacensis Vindobonensis (Leipzig 1900 ff.) [TLL]
- P. Thielscher, “Art. Vitruvius Mamurra”, *RE* 9A (1961) 427–489.
- D. F. S. Thomson (Hg.), *Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary* (Toronto 1997).

In Cat. 41. 1 *ambubaia* is suggested as an emendation for the transmitted *Ameana*. The word would refer to the addressee’s status of a professional prostitute, and there are paleographic arguments in its favour.

В стихотворении Катутлла 41, 1 вместо рукописного *Ameana* предлагается исправление *ambubaia*. Это слово могло указывать на принадлежность адресата к продажным женщинам, и в его защиту приводятся палеографические соображения.

Vsevolod Zeltchenko

LE MOUCHOIR DE VATINIUS
(QUINT. INST. VI, 3, 60)

Au milieu du chapitre de l'*Institution oratoire* qui traite du rire, Quintilien cherche à systématiser les plaisanteries qui se fondent sur la comparaison (*similitudo* ; VI, 3, 58–63). Une étape de cette classification un peu forcée est présentée dans l'édition de M. Winterbottom de la manière suivante (60 = Calv. 24 Malcovati) :¹

Sunt quaedam †vi† similia, unde Vatinius dixit hoc dictum, cum reus agente in eum Calvo frontem candido sudario tergeret idque ipsum accusator in invidiam vocaret: 'quamvis reus sum', inquit, 'et panem tamen candidum edo'.²

Un humaniste italien anonyme de la première moitié du XV^{ème} siècle, en copiant *cod. Paris. lat. 77223*, fut probablement le premier à comprendre la plaisanterie de Vatinius, puisqu'il écrivit *panem* au lieu de *parentem* que l'on retrouve dans tous les autres manuscrits.³

¹ Winterbottom 1970, 347.

² Il faut qu'on entre d'abord dans les menus détails de grammaire. *Dixit hoc dictum* fut expulsé comme une glose (Burmans 1720, 546 *secutus codd. rec.* ; [hoc dictum] *del. iam* Colinaeus 1541, 720 v.) ou bien corrigé en *duxit* (van der Wulp 1849, 45). Ces interventions seraient également superflues : *dictum dicere* est une figure étymologique parfaitement attestée (Müller 1908, 6–7), et *inquit* pléonastique (Szantyr 1958, 1773, 50 suivv. ; Hoffman–Szantyr 1972, 418) trouve un parallèle dans VI, 1, 27. La conjonction *et* dans la riposte de Vatinius (*del. Meyerus* 1842, 477 ; *at* van der Wulp 1849, 45) est injustement classée, dans quelques études contemporaines sur la 'parahypotaxe' latin, parmi les exemples d'*et apodoticum* : en fait, elle veut dire simplement 'je mange du pain blanc aussi' (Galdi 2014, 78). Sur l'indicatif après *quamvis* ([*quamvis reus sum*] *del. Vasi* [Σ. Βάση] 1909/1910, 184) v. *infra*, n. 11.

³ Bien que le père de Calvus, selon Valère Maxime (IX, 12, rom. 7), se soit suicidé avec un *sudarium*, cet anecdote (raconté *infra*, n. 19) ne doit pas être évoqué pour défendre *parentem*. Dans le chapitre VI, 3 Quintilien, fidèle à son but didactique, explique toutes les connotations nécessaires des plaisanteries qu'il cite ; la réponse de Vatinius, il la croyait donc claire sans quelconque renseignement biographique.

Deux philologues ont désormais modifié cette correction brillante en l'accommodant à *ratio corruptelae* : M. Haupt proposa *panem item*⁴ et M. Winterbottom *panem tamen*, ce qui nous semble supérieur.⁵ La coutume exigeait que l'accusé se présentât au tribunal habillé en deuil, *in veste sordida* ; Calvus, dans l'emportement de sa colère oratoire, dénonça le mouchoir blanc tiré machinalement par son adversaire comme une violation du *dress-code* faisant preuve du cynisme⁶ ou bien de l'aplomb de Vatinius,⁷ tandis que celui-ci haussa les épaules : « Pourquoi en faire tout un fromage ? Tu pourrais aussi bien m'accuser de manger du pain blanc ». ⁸ La riposte s'appliquerait bien au sens de l'humour assez particulier de Vatinius, le *scurra venustus ac dicax* (Sen. *Const. sap.* 17, 3) : en effet, ce nabab et *Realpolitiker*, initié pourtant à la philosophie pythagoricienne, aimait se donner l'apparence d'un homme commun, étranger aux subtilités intellectuelles, mais qui ne se perd jamais dans les nues et appelle les choses par leur propre nom.⁹ Cette intonation distinctive se révèle non seulement dans les multiples *dicta* de Vatinius conservés par la tradition anecdotique, mais aussi dans ses deux lettres à Cicéron, flatteuses et narquoises à la fois (*Ad fam.* V, 9–10).

⁴ Haupt 1873, 579–580.

⁵ Notons que ce fut Érasme qui, bien avant Winterbottom, trouva ce *tamen* quand il résumait le passage de Quintilien apparemment sans vouloir en corriger le texte (*Apophthegm.* VI, *varie mixta* 28 : *Quamquam, inquit, sum reus, tamen et panem candidum edo*).

⁶ La tragédie récente à Kemerovo, où l'incendie d'un centre commercial le 25 mars 2018 fit quarante enfants morts, a fourni une illustration inattendue de ce type de cynisme. Quand les habitants de la ville se sont rassemblés devant la mairie, un des responsables régionaux leur fit face en chemise blanche. Aux reproches de la foule il lança « Est-ce que vous pensez vraiment qu'après la mort des enfants on ne peut plus mettre une chemise blanche ? » (<https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/3586141>).

⁷ Cf., e. g., Plut. *Cic.* 35 : selon Plutarque, la condamnation de Milon était due au fait qu'il négligea le deuil et apparut devant les juges en toge blanche, se croyant acquitté d'avance.

⁸ I. N. Marques rend la plaisanterie de Vatinius invraisemblablement compliquée, en supposant les associations paronymiques *panem / pannem* (i. e. *pannum*) et *edo, edi / edo, edidi* : Vatinius voudrait donc dire que ses vêtements déchirés sont aussi purs que sa conscience (Marques 2008, 120). Cependant *pannum edo (-didi)* est un non-sens, et le paradigme **pannis, -is* (que Marques qualifie d'archaïque) un fantôme. On peut deviner que Marques s'appuie sur la forme *pannibus*, utilisée, selon les témoignages des grammairiens, par Ennius et Pomponius ; mais cet hétéroclisme, comme il est naturel chez les mots en *-us*, suppose la confusion de la deuxième et de la quatrième déclinaisons (Hodges 1984, 232, 22 suivv.).

⁹ N'oublions pas que c'est à l'éloquence de Vatinius que César accorda, l'an 48, une tâche risquée et difficile d'adresser la parole aux soldats de Pompée sur les bords de l'Apsus (Caes. *BC* III, 100).

Les plaidoyers contre Vatinius, rendus immortels par Catulle (*Carm.* 53), furent un grand moment tant pour Licinius Calvus que pour toute l'éloquence atticiste à Rome. Cent ans après, dans les écoles rhétoriques on n'a pas cessé d'étudier leur texte (Tac. *Dial.* 21, 2) et de savourer les détails impressionnants des procès : ainsi, Sénèque-père rapporte l'exclamation de Vatinius « *Rogo vos, iudices : num, si iste disertus est, ideo me damnari oportet?* » (*Controv.* VII, 4, 6). Cela fait penser que la plaisanterie du pain blanc n'est pas un vrai et propre *orationis Vatini fragmentum*,¹⁰ mais que Quintilien l'avait plutôt apprise *via* la tradition légendaire circulant dans les milieux rhétoriques :¹¹ ainsi, quelques moqueries grossières que Vatinius, comme on prétendait, adressa devant le barreau à son persécuteur (cette fois non Calvus, mais Cicéron) ont survécu jusqu'à l'époque de Macrobe (*Sat.* II, 1, 13; 3, 5).

Est-il possible de préciser les circonstances qui emmenèrent Vatinius à s'éponger le front ? La tâche semble désespérée, d'autant plus que non seulement la datation, mais le nombre même d'*orationes Vatini* de Calvus (d'après Tac. *Dial.* 21, 2, il dut en prononcer plus que deux) est fortement discuté. *Opinio communis* présume les procès de 58, 56 et 54 ;¹² cependant, E. S. Gruen a suffisamment démontré que le premier et surtout le deuxième point de cette reconstruction demeurent au moins problématiques.¹³ Néanmoins, plus d'un historien, y compris Gruen lui-même, ont cédé à la tentation de rapprocher notre passage à *Inst.* IX, 2, 25 (= Calv. 23 Malcovati), où Quintilien donne l'exemple de *permissio* :

ut Calvus Vatini 'perfrica frontem et dic te digniorem, qui praetor fieres, quam Catonem'.

Puisque ce fragment peut être daté d'une façon incontestable (n° 292 Alexander : août 54, Calvus impute à Vatinius l'infraction de *lex*

¹⁰ C'est l'opinion de Gundel 1955, 516. Rien n'indique que Vatinius ait jamais publié quelconque discours.

¹¹ J. H. Schmalz proclama Vatinius un archaïsant de rigueur, invoquant, parmi d'autres preuves tirées de ses deux lettres à Cicéron, l'indicatif après *quamvis* dans notre passage (Schmalz 1881, 40). En contestant justement cette hypothèse, V. D. Lebek remarque que le styliste le plus raffiné n'aurait pas su orner une réplique spontanée d'un trait archaïque artificiel (Lebek 1970, 128). À notre avis, on peut aller plus loin : puisque Quintilien lui-même utilise *quamvis* + *ind.* à VIII, 6, 73, on a d'autant moins de raisons de rapporter à Vatinius les paroles exactes *Quamvis reus sum* etc.

¹² N° 255, 274, 292 selon l'inventaire de M. Ch. Alexander (Alexander 1990). On supposait aussi les procès de 62 (Castorina 1946, 40) et un second de 54 (e. g. : Matthies 1874, 113 ; Lintott 1968, 219–220).

¹³ Gruen 1967, 217–221.

Tullia de ambitu pendant les élections prétoriales de l'année précédente, quand il avait battu Caton ; Cicéron le défend, et avec succès), la controverse du mouchoir blanc devrait donc être rattachée au même procès.¹⁴

Ce rapprochement est pourtant erroné. *Perfricare* ne signifie point 'essuyer' (comme *tergere* ou *siccare*¹⁵), mais 'frotter' (e. g., *corpus unguento*) : pour se frotter le front, on n'a pas besoin d'un mouchoir. D'autant plus, *perfricare frontem* (*os, faciem*) est une expression idiomatique bien connue dont le sens est 'rejeter toute pudeur'.¹⁶ Cf. Cic. *Tusc.* III, 41 (*nec fatemur eam nos dicere voluptatem, quam tu [i.e. Epicurus] idem, cum os perfricuisti, soles dicere?*) ; Mart. XI, 27, 7 (*aut cum perfrucit frontem posuitque pudorem*) ; Petron. 132 ; Plin. *NH* praef. 4 ; Sen. *Ep.* 40, 13 ; *Quaest. nat.* IV, praef. 9 ; *Paneg. Lat.* 5, 9, 3 et, *last not least*, Quint. *Inst.* XI, 3, 160 où Quintilien stigmatise la manière des certains orateurs de *perfricare faciem et quasi improbam facere*.¹⁷

Cependant, on espère pouvoir dire quelque chose sur le contexte historique de l'épisode. Il est à remarquer que l'anecdote rapporté par Quintilien flatte l'ingéniosité de Vatinius mais pas celle de son adversaire. Il est vrai que Calvus avait la réputation d'un orateur non seulement méticuleux et pédantesque (e. g. Cic. *Brut.* 283 : *ipse sese observans metuensque, ne vitiosum colligeret, etiam verum sanguinem deperdebat*), mais aussi passionné jusqu'à perdre la maîtrise de soi (e. g. Sen. *Controv.* VII, 4, 6: *violentus actor et concitatus fuit <...>*; *solebat praeterea excedere subsellia sua et impetu latus usque in adversariorum partem*

¹⁴ Münzer 1926, 431 ; Castorina 1946, 55 ; Neudlung 1955, 179 ; Gruen 1967, 230 n. 44 ; Alexander 1990, 142.

¹⁵ Cf. Quint. *Inst.* XI, 3, 148 : *sudario frontem siccare*.

¹⁶ On peut l'expliquer diversement : se frotter le front pour 'effacer' les signes de la pudeur (Tondo 1994, 108) ou bien pour 'engourdir' la peau afin qu'elle perde la capacité de rougir (Lamacchia 1978, 970 ; Courtney 2013, 494, ad Iuv. 13, 242 ; cf. *dura frons*).

¹⁷ *Erasm. Adag.* 747 ; Otto 1890, 130, n° 631 ; Häussler 1968, 102, 160 ; Lamacchia 1978, 969–972 ; Delhey 1995, 1402, 49 suivv. ; Tondo 1994, 103–109 ; Keyer 2012, 286 ; Cabré Lunas 2016. L'expression grecque analogue se retrouve chez Strabon (XIII, 1, 45, 603 C : ἐχρῆν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο πλάσαι παρατριψαμένους τὸ μέτωπον) et, selon la supposition persuasive de W. Leaf, peut être un calque du latin (Leaf 1923, 213–214). En effet, dans les passages d'Aeschines et de Posidonius, auxquels renvoie St. Radt pour contester la possibilité de l'emprunt (Radt 2008, 494 ; v. aussi Lamacchia 1978, 972), le 'frottement du front', cette fois réel et non métaphorique, a d'autres connotations : cf. le commentaire précis de I. G. Kidd a Posid. F 253, 94 Edelstein – Kidd : « An oratorical gesture of rubbing his forehead, as if emphasizing the anxiety of his impending advice [cf. Aeschines 2, 49] » (Kidd 1988, 875–876).

transcurrere) ;¹⁸ mais l'idée de s'en prendre à un détail aussi insignifiant qu'un *sudarium candidum*¹⁹ semble vouée d'avance à l'échec. Même pour les Romains, si scrupuleux au regard du code vestimentaire, il est difficile de partager l'indignation quelque peu exagérée de Calvus : par contre, Vatinius aurait passé pour un hypocrite s'il s'était trop soigneusement procuré un mouchoir sombre assorti à sa toge.²⁰ Quelle était la raison de Calvus pour commettre une telle erreur et prêter si facilement le flanc à son adversaire ?

Ici il faudrait évoquer la *Interrogatio in P. Vatinius testem* cicéronienne prononcée au mois de mars 56 dans le cadre du procès de Sestius (dont Calvus, tout comme Cicéron, fut alors parmi les défenseurs : Cic. *Epist. ad Quint. fr.* II, 4, 1) et publiée au plus tard au milieu de l'année suivante.²¹ Dans ce discours Cicéron rappelle l'incident qui eut lieu en 59 :²² Vatinius, alors tribun, et sa clique se présentèrent vêtus en deuil (*atrati*) au banquet solennel donné par Q. Arrius au temple de Castor

¹⁸ Le tempérament de Calvus s'opposerait donc à ses principes théoriques (Krüger 1913, 35–36) ; on pourrait penser que Catull. 53 met en relief cette opposition d'une manière burlesque (sur le contraste entre *explicare* et *disertus* dans le poème catullien v. : Gavrilov 2015, 125 suivv.).

¹⁹ Comme l'indique Mart. XI, 39, 3, les *sudaria* en lin fin (la traduction 'mouchoir' n'est pas tout à fait correcte puisqu'on ne se mouchoit pas dedans : Becker–Göll 1882, 268), même s'ils n'étaient pas nécessairement blancs, avaient au moins une couleur claire. Ici on doit mentionner l'hypothèse de Jean-Michel David (David 1992, 420–421) qui met notre passage en relation avec Val. Max. IX, 12, *Rom.* 7 (C. Licinius Macer [par coïncidence, le père de Calvus] s'étouffa avec son mouchoir après avoir compris que les juges votèrent pour sa condamnation) aussi bien qu'avec les figures humaines tenant dans leur mains les morceaux d'étoffe qui se discernent sur deux reliefs romains de caractère judiciaire (n° 71 et 93 dans Gabelmann 1984 ; ces figures ne sont pas forcément des plaideurs, et dans le second cas l'identification même du mouchoir est controversée). J.-M. David suppose donc qu'un mouchoir faisait partie du *dress-code* d'un accusé suppliant comme un objet symbolique pour éponger la sueur et les larmes. Notons pourtant l'adverbe *forte* chez Valère Maxime (*sudario, quod forte in manu habebat, ore et faucibus coartatis*) ; en outre, une autre version de la mort de Licinius Macer (Plut. *Cic.* 9) souligne spécialement qu'il déposa le deuil et mit les habits blancs, sûr de son acquittement ; finalement, Quintilien évoque ailleurs le *sudarium* comme un accessoire habituel de l'orateur en général et non d'un plaideur (XI, 13, 148).

²⁰ En annotant notre passage, Ch. Miotti affirme que le deuil romain réclamait un mouchoir noir (Miotti 2010, 68), ce qui est un bon exemple d'une scholie faite *ad hoc*. La mode de XIX–XX^{ème} siècles connaît les 'mouchoirs de deuil', mais rien de semblable n'est attesté pour l'antiquité.

²¹ Cousin 1995, 240–242, 254–255.

²² Comme l'avait bien vu Schütz 1809, 191, *terminus ante quem* est prêté par la mention ironique de *Vatinius epulo* dans Cic. *ad Att.* II, 7, 5 (mi-avril 59).

pour honorer la mémoire de son père.²³ Il s'agissait sans doute d'une démarche politique dont l'intention exacte nous échappe,²⁴ quoi qu'il en soit, Cicéron, qui dédie au festin d'Arrius plus d'une page du texte teubnerien (*In Vat.* 30–32), préfère représenter Vatinius comme un monstre qui a offensé le sentiment religieux du peuple entier²⁵ (citons, en guise d'échantillon, 31–32) :

Cum tot hominum milia accumberent, cum ipse epuli dominus, Q. Arrius, albatu esset, tu in templum Castoris te cum C. Fibulo atrato ceterisque tuis furiis funestum intulisti. Quis tum non ingemuit? quis non doluit rei publicae casum? qui sermo alius in illo epulo fuit nisi hanc tantam et tam gravem civitatem subiectam esse non modo furori, verum etiam irrisioni tuae? <...> Quae te tanta tenuit amentia, ut, nisi id fecisses, quod fas non fuit, nisi violasses templum Castoris, nomen epuli, oculos civium, morem veterem, eius qui te invitarat auctoritatem, parum putares testificatum esse supplicationes te illas non putare?

L'interpellation de Calvus apparaîtrait donc beaucoup plus conceptualisée et subtile si elle s'adressait au personnage qui avait déjà provoqué un scandale vestimentaire en se présentant en habit de deuil là où tout le monde était en blanc ; maintenant, tirant son *sudarium candidum* dans une situation parfaitement inverse, il prête à son adversaire une occasion à ne pas manquer.²⁶

²³ Les jeux funèbres et les *epulae* pouvant être donnés plusieurs années après les funérailles (Marshall–Baker 1975, 227–228 n. 31), l'inconvenance de l'habit sombre de Vatinius ne doit pas nous étonner.

²⁴ Selon le scholiaste (*Schol. Bob. ad Cic. Vat.* 30), dont on ne peut pas dire s'il était suffisamment informé, Vatinius, partisan des projets de César sur la Gaule, ignorait ainsi, d'une façon démonstrative, la *supplicatio* à l'honneur de la victoire de Gaius Pomptinus sur les Allobroges. Lily Ross Taylor avance une autre explication : pendant une *supplicatio* on ne pouvait pas convoquer des comices, tandis que Vatinius voulait faire passer le plus tôt possible ses fameuses lois (Taylor 1951, 263–264). L. G. Pocock, s'appuyant sur Cic. *ad Att.* II, 7, 3, n'exclut pas que l'escapade de Vatinius visait les ambitions électorales d'Arrius (Pocock 1926, 118).

²⁵ Haskell 2001, 141 ; comme le démontre J. Haskell, la violation du code vestimentaire forme un motif constant des invectives cicéroniennes, de Verrès à Antonius. Sur le scandale au banquet d'Arrius interprété comme un « conflit des rites » cf. Gavrilov 2000 [A. K. Гаврилов, “Белый траур в Греции и Риме II”], 166–167.

²⁶ Si on présume que l'épisode se déroula devant le tribunal de l'août 54, Calvus semble gagner quelques points supplémentaires : en fait, Cicéron, qui avait dénigré Vatinius à cause du banquet d'Arrius, cette fois-ci, obéissant à la demande des *triumviri*, s'en fit le défenseur.

Passons maintenant à la phrase énigmatique qui introduit la plaisanterie de Vatinius dans les manuscrits majeurs de Quintilien : *sunt quaedam vi similia*. Malgré quelques traductions de sang-froid telles que « il y a des rapprochements de fond » ou « vi sono somiglianze di senso »,²⁷ ce *vi* fut corrigé par C. Halm, L. Radermacher *et alii* (v. *infra*) et contesté par M. Haupt (« haec <...> intellegi nequeunt »), H. E. Butler (« unsatisfactory »), M. Winterbottom (« *vi* nondum explicatum; excidit fortasse aliquid ») et D. A. Russell (« text and interpretation again uncertain »).²⁸

Parmi les notes de lecture de D. R. Shackleton Bailey en marge de l'édition de Winterbottom on trouve une défense laconique de *vi* : « The handkerchief and the bread had in actual fact an essential quality <...> in common: whiteness ».²⁹ Le mouchoir blanc et le pain blanc se rapprochent donc non d'apparence (comme, e. g., un Julius maigre et courbé et la *fibula ferrea* : VI, 3, 58), mais de sens, « de fond » : mais quel est le *tertium comparationis* ? La couleur blanche, affirme Shackleton Bailey ; est-ce vraiment une « qualité essentielle » qui distingue notre comparaison parmi les autres exemples de Quintilien ? Le bon mot qui la précède (Auguste disant à un soldat qui lui tenait quelque document d'une façon trop timide : « C'est comme si tu donnais une monnaie à un éléphant » ; 59), ainsi que ceux qui la suivent (61–62), reposent eux aussi sur les « rapprochements de sens » ; cependant Quintilien traite les *vi similia* d'un genre à part (n'oublions non plus *quaedam* indiquant que les comparaisons de la sorte sont relativement rares).³⁰ Comme le remarqua à juste titre H. E. Butler, « *vi* is <...> unsatisfactory as introducing nothing new ».³¹ En outre, la section entière consacrée aux comparaisons ludiques (57–63) est introduite avec *acriora igitur sunt et elegantiora, quae trahuntur ex vi rerum; in iis maxime valet similitudo* :³² il en résulterait donc que parmi les plaisanteries basées sur la *vis rerum* les *quaedam vi similia* forment un groupe spécial !

Selon J. Cousin, « il est possible que Vatinius, parlant de pain blanc, signe d'aisance, ait voulu suggérer que Calvus était ladre et se nourrissait

²⁷ Bornecque 1933, 350–351 ; Corsi–Calcante 2008, 1065. Cf. aussi la traduction de H. Rahn, qui pourtant met *vi* entre deux croix : « Manchmal liegt die Ähnlichkeit in der Analogie » (Rahn 1995, 736–739).

²⁸ Haupt 1873, 579 ; Butler 1921, 470 ; Winterbottom 1970, 347 ; Russell 2001, 93.

²⁹ Shackleton Bailey 1983, 222.

³⁰ Ce *quaedam* est symptomatiquement omis dans les versions de H. Bornecque et de S. Corsi (citées *supra*).

³¹ Butler 1921, 470.

³² Quintilien les oppose aux maigres calembours tels que *Placidus – Acidus, Tullius – Tollius* (53), le type d'humour qu'il désapprouve.

de pain bis » (*panem candidum edo* sous-entendrait alors *aliter ac tu*).³³ Bien avant Cousin cette interprétation était développée par P. Burman et critiquée par G. L. Spalding :³⁴ en effet, la réplique d'un richard désinvolte « Oui, mon linge coûte cher, et, contrairement à toi, je mange du pain qui coûte cher lui aussi » ne pourrait point servir ni d'exemple d'ingéniosité ni de moyen efficace pour détourner les reproches d'un accusateur public.

Or, il est temps d'examiner de près les émendations. Le *veri similia* de quelques *recentiores* ne devrait pas être jugé comme une conjecture mais plutôt comme une interprétation de *vi* des manuscrits majeurs : comme on sait bien, le groupe *-er-* provoquait souvent une contraction³⁵. Faisant partie de la vulgate, cette leçon a pris pied dans toutes les éditions antérieures à 1868,³⁶ bien que Spalding, l'acceptant faute de mieux dans son texte, confesse aussitôt son doute : « Non videtur sufficere hoc ad significandum, quod vult scriptor » (cf. aussi Haupt : « non ausim quidem ineptum dicere, sicut Halmius fecit, sed non esse satis perspicuum fateor »).³⁷ Un des traducteurs français, l'abbé Gédoyne (1718), tenta héroïquement de l'expliquer, fut-ce au prix de la réécriture complète du passage : « Il y a des choses qui sont vraisemblables *et dont tout le plaisant consiste dans cette vraisemblance* ». ³⁸

Les appareils critiques modernes enregistrent aussi l'émendation étrange de Carl Halm *vitii similia* (« il y a ceux qui sont semblables au vice » ?).³⁹ Haupt en demeura perplexe : « Neque enim in dicto Vatini, si modo scripturae vitium tollitur, quicquam est vitii, neque vitiosa hic commemoranda erant, sed certa species dictorum e simili sumptorum ». ⁴⁰ À notre avis, l'intention de Halm est assez particulière pour exiger une digression. En effet, son édition de 1868 fut la première *recensio* critique

³³ Cousin 1977, 202.

³⁴ Burmannus 1720, 546 (Burman ignorait encore la leçon *vi* et avait affaire à *veri similia* ; v. *infra*) ; Spalding 1803, 570–571.

³⁵ Lindsay 1915, 334.

³⁶ L'apparition anachronique de *veri similia* dans l'édition de F. Plessis témoigne encore une fois qu'il ne se souciait que fort peu de la critique textuelle (Plessis 1896, 34 ; *test.* XV).

³⁷ Spalding 1803, 570 ; Haupt 1873, 579.

³⁸ Cité d'après : Gédoyne 1812, 165. W. Guthrie ne semble que varier la tirade de Gédoyne, en s'éloignant davantage de l'original : « Sometimes there is a patness in things, as if they happened on purpose to give rise to this kind of wit » (Guthrie 1756, 53). « La plaisanterie consiste quelquefois à dire ce qui a un air de vérité » (Ouzille 1840, 197) est, à notre avis, sibyllin, et « Jokes sometimes rest on some fanciful comparison » (Watson 1856, 443) vide de sens.

³⁹ Halm 1868, 321.

⁴⁰ Haupt 1873, 579.

du traité de Quintilien : c'est à Halm que remonte l'honneur de séparer les manuscrits importants d'un amas de *descripti* et d'établir la *paradosis*. Halm fut donc le premier à comprendre que la leçon de la vulgate *veri similia* est sans appui, tandis que tous les manuscrits d'importance stemmatique portent *visimilia* ou bien *insimilia*. En même temps il a appris (de la collation faite pour lui par W. Studemund) que l'*Ambrosianus* de IX^{ème} siècle,⁴¹ c'est-à-dire un des deux fondements de la recension de Quintilien, comme Halm lui-même avait postulé, présente *visisimilia*, le premier *s* étant inscrit par une seconde main sur une lettre rasée.⁴² Telle est la *paradosis* dont Halm semble partir : en cherchant à restituer la leçon originelle de **A**,⁴³ il trouve le mot dans lequel le correcteur aurait pu changer la troisième lettre, et ce mot est *viti*. Il est clair que le sens du texte est beaucoup moins important pour Halm que la reconstruction de l'archétype épuré des corrections : pour la même raison il repousse singulièrement le *panem candidum* (« inepte ») et rétablit *parentem candidum* entre deux croix. En d'autres termes, le *vitii* de Halm n'est pas une vraie et propre conjecture visant à élucider le passage.

Le *visu similia*, avancé indépendamment par M. Hertz et S. Vasi,⁴⁴ paraît contredire tant le contexte (le pain blanc n'est pas 'semblable à voir' à un mouchoir blanc) que l'usage (on aimerait voir des exemples de *visu similis* avant Isidore de Séville). Finalement, en 1907 L. Radermacher proposa *vix similia* (*dub. in app.* ; son texte porte †*vi*),⁴⁵ depuis lors accepté et défendu par G. Monaco.⁴⁶ Il en résulterait que dans le catalogue des *similitudines* une section spéciale serait réservée aux « choses dissemblables ». Monaco entend *vix similia* comme *des rapprochements difficiles et par cela recherchés* (« si accenna qui a casi nei quali la somiglianza si ravvisa con difficoltà <...>. La cosa appare confermata del seguente *adhuc est subtilior* [61], col quale si passa a casi di somiglianza ancor più ricercata ») ; mais si Quintilien avait voulu exprimer cette idée, il aurait dû l'articuler d'une façon plus nette et détaillée.

⁴¹ Halm le datait pourtant d'XI^{ème} siècle.

⁴² Les restrictions pandémiques de 2020 nous empêchent de consulter **A** pour vérifier ces données *de visu*. Les appareils critiques de Radermacher, Cousin et Winterbottom ne mentionnent ni *visi-* ni la rasure.

⁴³ Dans sa *Praefatio* Halm proclame qu'une tâche prioritaire des futurs éditeurs de Quintilien est celle de retrouver des leçons authentiques de **A** remplacées par le correcteur (Halm 1868, VI–VII).

⁴⁴ Hertz 1872, 852; Vasi 1909/1910, 184.

⁴⁵ Radermacher 1907, 340.

⁴⁶ Monaco 1988, 64–65, 130 (« Certe somiglianze sono tali a mala pena ») ; *idem* : Miotti 2010, 68 (« Há alguns exemplos em que a semelhança dificilmente se vê »).

La phrase *sunt quaedam vi similia* devrait nécessairement être liée à la classification des *similitudines*. Traçons le plan de la section dédiée aux plaisanteries qui se fondent sur l’analogie (57–63). (1) Le comparant peut être cherché parmi les hommes, les animaux ou bien les objets inanimés (57–58) ; (2) le comparant peut être amplifié et prendre les dimensions d’un tableau (*parabole* ; « C’est comme si tu donnais une monnaie à un éléphant », 59) ; (3) notre cas (60) ; (4) la comparaison peut être développée grâce au transfert d’une situation à l’autre, cette fois complètement imaginaire (*fictio* ;⁴⁷ un gladiateur poursuit un autre sans le frapper : « Il veut le prendre vivant », comme s’il s’agissait d’une bataille ou d’une chasse, 61) ; (5) la comparaison peut être renforcée par l’amphibologie (« ‘sic, inquit, petis tamquam Caesaris candidatus’. Nam illud *petis* ambiguum est », 62) ; (6) le meilleur procédé et celui de combiner les types divers : plus l’orateur en mêle, plus l’on rit (63). Quelle est la spécificité de la *similitudo Vatiniiana* dans cet entourage ? Il est absurde de propager les restrictions de deuil sur le mouchoir, riposte Vatinius ; si Calvus s’acharne contre le mot *candidus*, l’accusé devrait donc renoncer au pain blanc, ce qui serait une ineptie manifeste. Le mouchoir blanc et le pain blanc n’ont de commun que leurs *noms*, et c’est sur le rapprochement des noms que repose leur comparaison. Il est à souligner que la blague de Vatinius est à double fond, puisque l’opposé de *panis candidus*, c’est-à-dire le pain de la pire qualité, les Romains l’appelaient *panis sordidus* (Plaut. *Asin.* 142; Sen. *Ep.* 18, 7; Suet. *Ner.* 48; Non. Marc. p. 132, 8 Lindsay), en utilisant le même adjectif qui désignait les vêtements de deuil.⁴⁸

Nous supposons donc que Quintilien avait écrit *sunt quaedam verbis similia*.⁴⁹ Cette construction (contrairement à *vi similia*) n’est pas sans parallèles dans l’*Institutio oratoria* : cf. IX, 3, 79 (de homoeoptotis) *similia sint verbis* ; X, 2, 16 (de imitatoribus infelicibus) *verbis atque numeris sunt*

⁴⁷ Sur la définition de *fictio* rhétorique (καθ’ ὑπόθεσιν) cf. V, 10, 95–99.

⁴⁸ Contrairement à *panis candidus*, « *panis sordidus* ist nicht Bezeichnung einer Brodsorte, als vielmehr einer Qualität » (Voigt 1876, 122 n. 88). Sporadiquement on retrouve dans les textes *panis ater* (Ter. *Eun.* 939) et *niger* (Mart. XI, 56, 8). Sur les types de pain antique et sur leur nomenclature v. Mayor 1900, 256, 425 (ad Iuv. 5, 70) ; Blümner 1912, 74–78 ; Jasny 1950, 244–246 ; André 1981, 68–69.

⁴⁹ Plus qu’à la contraction directe *verbis* > *vis* (on s’attendrait plutôt à *vbis*), on pense à la confusion assez commune de *verbum* et *verum* (cf., e.g. XI, 1, 72: *vero*] *verbo Mb*; 3, 62: *veris*] *verbis b*) : *verbissimilia* > *veri(s)similia* > *visimilia*. Le *verisimilia* des *deteriores* est bien sûr d’une nature secondaire. Notons que dans le *codex unicus* de grammairien Cledonius (cod. Bern. 380, VI^{ème} siècle) le même *verbisimilia* s’est défiguré en *versissimilia* (GL V, 37, 13; corr. van Putschen in ed. pr.).

non multum differentes. Dans la même section réservée aux plaisanteries on lit (VI, 3, 78) : *repercutiendi multa sunt genera, venustissimum quod etiam similitudine aliqua verbi adiuvatur*.⁵⁰

Vsevolod Zeltchenko
Université de Saint-Pétersbourg
 v.zelchenko@spbu.ru

Bibliographie

- M. Ch. Alexander, *Trials in the Late Roman Republic, 149 BC to 50 BC* (Toronto 1990).
- J. André, *L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome* (Paris 21981).
- W. A. Becker, *Gallus, oder Römische Scenen aus der Zeit Augusts*. Neu bearb. von H. Göll. III (Berlin 1882).
- H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern I* (Leipzig –Berlin 1912).
- H. Bornecque (tr., ann.), *Quintilien. Institution oratoire II* (Paris [1933]).
- P. Burmannus (ed.), *M. Fabii Quintiliani De institutione oratoria libri duodecim* (Lugduni Batavorum 1720).
- H. E. Butler (tr.), *Quintilian. Institutio oratoria. Book IV–VI* (Cambridge, Mass. – London 1921).
- L. Cabré Lunas, “Del gest a la dita : *frontem (faciem, os) perfricare*”, dans : E. Borrell Vidal, Ó. de la Cruz Palma (éd.), *Omnia mutantur : Canvi, transformació e pervivència en la cultura clàssica, en les seves llengües i en el seu llegat II* (Barcelona 2016) 49–56.
- E. Castorina, *Licinio Calvo* (Catania 1946).
- S. Colinaeus (éd.), *M. Fabii Quintiliani Oratoriarum institutionum lib. XII* (Parisiis 1541).
- S. Corsi, C. M. Calcante (tr.), *Quintiliano. La formazione dell'oratore II* (Milano 32008).
- E. A. Courtney, *Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (Berkeley 2013).
- J. Cousin (éd., tr.), *Quintilien. Institution oratoire IV* (Paris 1977).
- J. Cousin (éd., tr.), *Cicéron, Discours XIV : Pour Sestius. Pour Vatinius*. 2^{ème} éd. rev., corr. et augm. par Ph. Moreau (Paris 1995).
- J.-M. David, *Le patronat judiciaire au dernier siècle de la République romaine* (Roma 1992).
- N. Delhey, “Perfrico”, *ThLL X*, 1 (1995) 1402–1404.

⁵⁰ Je remercie chaleureusement Natalia Segal pour son aide linguistique ainsi que Alexei Belikov, Carlo Lucarini et Isabella Tondo qui m'ont aimablement procuré quelques articles difficiles à trouver.

- H. Gabelmann, *Antike Audienz- und Tribunalszenen* (Darmstadt 1984).
- G. Galdi, “Some Considerations on the Apodotic Uses of *atque* and *et* (2nd c. BC – 2nd c. AD)”, *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13 (2014) 63–91.
- A. K. Gavrilov, “Belyj traur v Grecii i Rime II” [“Weiße Trauer bei den Griechen und bei den Römern II”], *Hyperboreus* 6 (2000) 157–187 (en russe, résumé en allemand).
- A. K. Gavrilov, “Crimina diserta (Cat. c. 53)”, *Philologia classica* 10 (2015) 114–135 (en russe, résumé en anglais).
- N. Gédoyen (tr.), *Quintilien. L’institution de l’orateur* II. Nouv. éd. rev., corr. et augm. (Lyon 1812).
- E. S. Gruen, “Cicero and Licinius Calvus”, *HSCPh* 71 (1967) 215–233.
- H. Gundel, “Vatinius 3”, *RE* 8A (1955) 495–520.
- W. Guthrie (tr., notes), *M. Fabius Quintilianus. Institutes of Eloquence* II (London 1756).
- R. Häussler (éd.), *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter...* (Hildesheim 1968).
- C. Halm (éd.), *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim* I (Lipsiae 1868).
- J. Haskell, “Cicero as Evidence for Attitudes for Dress in the Late Republic”, dans : J. L. Sebesta, L. Bonfante (éd.), *The World of Roman Costume* (Madison 2001) 133–142.
- M. Haupt, “Coniectanea” (1873), dans : *M. Hauptii Opuscula selecta* III, 1 (Lipsiae 1876) 536–640.
- M. Hertz, “Miscellen”, *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 42 (1872) 851–853.
- J. Hodges, “Pannus”, *ThLL* X, 1 (1984) 232–236.
- J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Neubearb. von A. Szantyr (München 21972).
- N. Jasny, “The Daily Bread of the Ancient Greeks and Romans”, *Osiris* 9 (1950) 227–253.
- D. Keyer, “Trimalchio’s Astrology: Naive Superstitions or Intentional Jokes? (Petr. *Sat.* 35. 1–5; 39. 5–12)”, *Hyperboreus* 18 (2012) 264–294.
- G. Kidd, *Posidonius. II : The Commentary* II (Cambridge 1988).
- M. C. Krüger, *Licinius Calvus : Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der römischen Beredsamkeit* (Breslau 1913).
- R. Lamacchia, “Aspetti di civiltà diverse in alcune espressioni idiomatiche tradizionali”, *RCCM* 20 (1978) 957–986.
- W. Leaf (éd., tr., comm.), *Strabo on the Troad : Book XIII, Cap. I* (Cambridge 1923).
- W. D. Lebek, *Verba prisca : Die Anfänge des Archaïsierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung* (Göttingen 1970).
- W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915).
- A. W. Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome* (Oxford 1968).
- I. N. Marques, Jr. *O riso segundo Cícero e Quintiliano : Tradução e comentários de De oratore, livro II, 216–291 (De ridiculis) e da Institutio Oratoria, Livro VI, 3 (De risu)*. Diss. (São Paulo 2008).

- B. A. Marshall, R. J. Baker, “The Aspirations of Q. Arrius”, *Historia* 24 (1975) 220–231.
- D. Matthies, “De G. [sic] Licinii Calvi in P. Vatinius accusationibus”, dans : *Commentationes philologicae* (Lipsiae 1874) 99–113.
- J. E. B. Mayor, *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal with a Commentary* (London 1900).
- H. Meyerus (éd.), *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta* (Turici 21842).
- Ch. Miotti, *Ridentem dicere verum : O humor retórico de Quintiliano e seu diálogo com Cícero, Catulo e Horácio*. Diss. (Campinas 2010).
- G. Monaco (éd., comm.), *Quintiliano. Il capitolo de risu* (inst. or. VI 3) (Palermo 21988).
- C. F. G. Müller, *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen* (Leipzig 1908).
- F. Münzer, “Licinius 113”, *RE* 13 (1926) 428–435.
- Ch. L. Neudlung, *A Prosopography of Catullus* (Oxford 1955).
- A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig 1890).
- C. V. Ouizille (tr.), *Institution oratoire de Quintilien III* (Paris 1840).
- F. Plessis, *Calvus : Éd. complète des fragments et des témoignages. Étude bibliographique et littéraire* (Paris 1896).
- L. G. Pocock, *A Commentary on Cicero, In Vatinius* (London 1926).
- L. Radermacher (éd.), *M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae libri XIII* (Lipsiae 1907).
- St. Radt (éd., tr., comm.), *Strabons Geographika VII* (Göttingen 2008).
- H. Rahn (éd., tr.), *M. Fabius Quintilianus. Ausbildung des Redners I* (Darmstadt 31995).
- D. A. Russell (éd., tr.), *Quintilian. The Orator's Education III* (Cambridge, Mass. 2001).
- A. Szantyr, “Inquam”, *ThLL* VII, 1 (1958) 1763–1797.
- J. H. Schmalz, “Über die Latinität des P. Vatinius in den bei Cicero *ad fam.* V, 9 und 10 erhaltenen Briefen”, dans : *Grossherzogliches Gymnasium Mannheim. Jahresbericht für das Schuljahr 1880/81* (Mannheim 1881) 27–48.
- Ch. G. Schütz (éd.), *M. T. Ciceronis Epistolae ad Atticum, ad Quintum fratrem et quae vulgo ad familiares dicuntur temporis ordine dispositi I* (Halae 1809).
- D. R. Shackleton Bailey, “Notes on Quintilian”, *HSCP* 87 (1983) 217–240.
- G. L. Spalding (éd., comm.), *M. Fabii Quintiliani De institutione oratoria libri duodecim II* (Lipsiae 1803).
- L. R. Taylor, “On the Chronology of Caesar's First Consulship”, *AJPh* 72 (1951) 254–268.
- I. Tondo, “L'oratore spudorato”, dans : G. Petrone (ed.), *Le passioni della retorica* (Palermo 2004) 97–114.
- S. Vasi, “Quintilianeae”, *Epistimoniki epetiris. Ionikon Panepistimion* 6 (1909/1910) 171–184.
- M. Voigt, “Die verschiedenen Sorten von Triticum, Weizen-Mehl und Brod bei den Römern”, *RhM* 31 (1876) 109–131.
- J. S. Watson (tr.), *Quintilian's Institutes of Oratory I* (London 1856).

- M. Winterbottom (éd.), *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim* I (Oxford 1970).
- J. C. van der Wulp, *Specimen litterarium augurale continens observationes criticas in locos nonnullos scriptorum utriusque linguae* (Lugduni Batavorum 1849).

The subject of the paper is an exchange between Calvus (the prosecutor) and Vatinius (the defendant) preserved by Quintilianus (*Inst.* 6. 3. 60 = Calv. 24 Malcovati) in the section dedicated to the oratorical jokes. Its first part deals with the historical context of the dialogue: the popular parallel *Inst.* 9. 2. 25 (= Calv. 23 Malcovati) has nothing in common with it, since *perfricare frontem* in 9. 2. 25 is simply a well-known idiom. Meanwhile, Calvus's invective, extravagant and petty as it is (he attacks Vatinius for wiping his forehead with a white handkerchief which violated the mourning dress code of the defendant), seems justified if it subtly hints at the events of 59 BC, when Vatinius had deliberately appeared *atratus* at the solemn banquet of Quintus Arrius and provoked a scandal. The second part aims to demonstrate that the words *sunt quaedam vi similia* introducing Vatinius's joke are not sound, and all the emendations proposed are unsatisfactory; Quintilian probably wrote *sunt quaedam verbis similia*.

Статья посвящена обмену репликами между Кальвом (обвинителем) и Ватинием (подсудимым), сохранившемся у Квинтилиана в том разделе *Institutio oratoria*, где классифицируются шутки в ораторской речи (VI, 3, 60 = Calv. 24 Malcovati). В первой части высказываются соображения о контексте, в котором могли быть произнесены эти слова. Популярная гипотеза, соотносящая наш отрывок с Quint. *Inst.* IX, 2, 25 (= Calv. 23 Malcovati), не может быть принята: *perfricare frontem* в IX, 2, 25 имеет обычное идиоматическое значение. С другой стороны, странная и как будто мелочная претензия Кальва (он упрекает Ватиния в том, что тот обтер лоб белым платком, между тем как обвиняемому полагается носить траур) получает основание, если видеть в ней намек на события 59 г. до н. э., когда Ватиний, наоборот, демонстративно явился в трауре на пир Квинта Аррия, скандализируя собравшихся. Во второй части предлагается конъектура к словам, вводящим шутку Ватиния у Квинтилиана: вместо рукописного *sunt quaedam vi similia* (которое большинство современных издателей или признают испорченным, или исправляют) следует читать *sunt quaedam verbis similia*.

Maria N. Kazanskaya

ΙΦΙΑΝΑΣΣΑ: A LOST HOMERIC READING
IN LUCIAN?

Nereids play an important part in Lucian's *Dialogi marini*, participating in five of the fifteen dialogues. According to the tradition Nereids were fifty, and their names are preserved in two catalogues of different length and intent: a list of thirty-three names is given by Homer, as Thetis, accompanied by her sisters, performs a γόος anticipating Achilles' premature death, and the lengthy list of names is meant to enhance the significance and the solemnity of her lament (*Il.* 18. 37–49);¹ the second catalogue of fifty names is given by Hesiod, when he speaks of Nereus' progeniture (*Th.* 240–264). It has been suggested that a similar catalogue may have appeared in the epic poem *Aethiopis* in the episode of lament for Achilles, as Proclus in his summary of the poem in the *Chrestomathy* says that the Muses and the Nereids were by Thetis' side as she mourned her son.² However, a close look at the *Dialogi marini* shows beyond doubt that in choosing the Nereids for his dialogues Lucian was using the catalogues in the *Iliad* and in *Theogony* and even taking into consideration the placement of the Nereids' names in the two lists. Thus, in the first dialogue, while Galatea's participation (as the object of Polyphemus' love) was indispensable, her pairing with Doris was due to the fact that their names appear in the verse used with minimal change in both catalogues:

Δωρίς καὶ Πανόπη καὶ ἀγακλειτὴ Γαλάτεια... (*Il.* 18. 45).

Δωρίς καὶ Πανόπη καὶ εὐειδῆς Γαλάτεια... (*Th.* 250).

¹ For the discussion of the effect produced by the catalogue of Nereids in *Il.* 18. 37–49, see Edwards 1991, 147–148 (n. on *Il.* 18. 39–49); Tsagalis 2018, 60.

² Καὶ Θέτις ἀφικομένη σὺν Μούσαις καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς (*scil.* Νηρεΐσιν) θρηνεῖ τὸν παῖδα (Procl. *Chr.* 172 Severyns). This suggests that the Nereids accompanying Thetis would have been listed, at least in part, and Neoanalysts consider the catalogue of Nereids in the *Iliad* as derived from the *Aethiopis* (or rather, from the oral version of the *Aethiopis*): see West 2003, 2–5; cf. Kakridis 1949, 66–73; Krafft 1963, 144; Rengakos 2015, 315–317; West 2011, 344; Davies 2016, 20; Currie 2016, 121–126.

In *DMar.* 7 Galene and Panope are chosen for the sake of their names,³ and both originate from Hesiod's catalogue (*Th.* 244 and 250 = *Il.* 18. 45, respectively). In *DMar.* 12, Thetis (who appears in the Hesiod's catalogue at *Th.* 244) is chosen to narrate the misfortunes of Danae and the infant Theseus, because her personal story, i.e. the loss of her only son under Troy, renders her uniquely suited for a compassionate account of the young mother's plight; Lucian pairs her up in this dialogue with Doris (from *Th.* 250 = *Il.* 18. 45), it seems, in order to counterbalance the pair from *DMar.* 7, Galene and Panope, who appear in the same verses 244 and 250 of *Theogony*. In *DMar.* 6 Amphitrite's appearance is due to her being Poseidon's consort and thus the only Nereid capable of confronting him over Helle's death.⁴

The only name that is found neither in Homer's nor in Hesiod's catalogue of the Nereids is Iphianassa who appears in the fourteenth dialogue: given that her voice in this dialogue is an authoritative one (in particular, she determines that the Nereids will not pursue Andromeda and Perseus), it is obvious that Lucian chose this particular Nereid for her name; still, due to her absence from the two standard catalogues, she stands out among the other Nereids of *Dialogi marini*. What is even more troubling, Lucian is the only ancient author to mention Iphianassa the Nereid. Pseudo-Apollodorus mentions Iphianassa as the wife of Endymion of Elis and the mother of Aetolus.⁵ The same Pseudo-Apollodorus names Iphianassa among the three daughters of Proetus and Stheneboeia (*Bibl.* 1. 7. 6).⁶ Another Iphianassa appears in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Post-homerica* as the mother of Menalces by Medon (8. 295–297). Finally, in Homer Iphianassa is the name of Agamemnon's and Clytemnestra's daughter (*Il.* 9. 145 and 287): ancient readers alternatively identified her

³ Γαλήνη, as her name implies, is associated with a calm sea, and Lucian engages in wordplay with her name when he has Galene explain her absence from Thetis' and Peleus' wedding: ὁ γὰρ Ποσειδῶν ἐκέλευσέ με, ὦ Πανόπη, ἀκύμαντον ἐν τοσοῦτῳ φυλάττειν τὸ πέλαγος (*DMar.* 7. 1). Panope, on the other hand, was present and is able to recount in detail the events she witnessed; cf. Bartley 2009, 102: "Lucian opens with a pun by having Panope, whose name implies that she is all-seeing, say straightforwardly to Galene 'Did you see...?' A similar pun on Galene's name follows at l. 5".

⁴ Amphitrite appears twice in Hesiod's catalogue of the Nereids (*Hes. Th.* 243 and 254) and is later mentioned as Poseidon's consort at *Th.* 930. She is known to Homer as Poseidon's wife, but does not appear in the catalogue of lamenting Nereids at *Il.* 18. 37–49 because of her high status.

⁵ Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 1. 7. 6; but cf. Paus. 5. 1. 4.

⁶ Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 2. 2; Iphianassa the daughter of Proetus appears in *Hes. fr.* 129. 24 Merkelbach–West and as such is also mentioned by Servius (*Comm. in Buc.* 6. 48).

with Iphigenia (cf. in particular, *Lucr.* 1. 85) – the third variant of her name would be Iphimede known to Hesiod (fr. 23. 13–26 Merkelbach–West) – or distinguished them as different figures.⁷

Given Lucian’s attention to the choice of characters and his skillful use of names to refer to literary models or to suggest new perspectives on a well-known myth, the isolated position of Iphianassa in the *Dialogi marini*, where intertextuality plays an important part, is problematic indeed. There seem to be several possibilities to explain Lucian’s use of this particular name.

In their respective editions of Lucian, Macleod and Bartley have suggested that Iphianassa’s name was due a mistake of some kind: Macleod thought that Lucian might have remembered it wrongly, or might have been using a faulty text, while Bartley was willing to consider the possibility of Lucian himself mistaking the name or deliberately inventing a different one.⁸ However, the idea that the name Iphianassa is due to a *lapsus memoriae* is inconsistent with the attention that Lucian shows to the choice of Nereids throughout the *Dialogi marini*, and there seems to be no reason for his inventing a name for this particular Nereid, while all other names are taken either from Homer’s or from Hesiod’s catalogue of Nereids. Another solution would be to suggest that the name Iphianassa originated from a different source, e. g. from the catalogue of Nereids that can be reconstructed for the poem *Aethiopsis*. This possibility cannot, of course, be excluded, but this is unlikely: could Lucian expect his readers to recognize a name from a Cyclic poem that was no longer widely read

⁷ See *Schol. Soph. El.* 157 with reference to the *Cypria*. While the identification of Iphimede with Iphigenia is self-evident from the description of her sacrifice (cf. Solmsen 1981), the equivalence between Iphianassa and Iphigenia is less straightforward, as in *Il.* 9. 145 she is listed among daughters that Agamemnon would be willing to give to Achilles; obviously, this would imply that she was alive at the moment of the offer and that the sacrifice had not taken place. Modern scholars are divided in their approach to the multiplicity of names: Iphigeneia, Iphianassa and Iphimede are identified as one and the same person by Wright 2005, 70 n. 35, Robbins 2013, 227; Iphigenia and Iphianassa are considered equivalent by Nagy 2017, while Hainsworth 1993, 77 notes: “It is likely enough that Iphianassa and Iphigeneia are variants of the same name, but the discrepancies from the later canonical version of Agamemnon’s family soon began to trouble genealogists [...] The Homeric names probably reflect an eastern or Ionian, as opposed to a western or mainland, tradition”. Kanavou 2015, 145 views the names of Agamemnon’s daughters as speaking names that reflect his royal status, and also (for Laodike and Chrysothemis) his willingness to make amends to Achilles.

⁸ See Macleod 1987, 255 in his *apparatus criticus*: “noster perperam meminisse vel texto corrupto uti potuit”; Bartley 2009, 156: “it is equally possible that Lucian has misheard the name, invented it or adapted another one”.

in Roman times?⁹ Alternatively, it would be possible to imagine that Iphianassa might have been mentioned in one of the two *Andromeda* plays (by Sophocles and by Euripides), to which *DMar.* 14 is largely indebted.¹⁰ However, it is fairly certain that neither of them showed the Nereids on stage, and even more importantly, the presentation of the situation from the perspective of the Nereids seems to be Lucian's major innovation in this dialogue, and so the name Iphianassa probably cannot be traced back to Classical tragedy.

I would like to suggest a solution that dovetails with the second part of Macleod's suggestion ("texto corrupto uti potuit"): Lucian was probably using the Homeric catalogue of the Nereids, and his Ἰφιάνασσα is a lost variant reading for Ἰάνασσα at *Il.* 18. 47. The part of the catalogue in the *Iliad* where Ἰάνασσα is mentioned runs thus (*Il.* 18. 42–49):

καὶ Μελίτη καὶ Ἴαιρα καὶ Ἀμφιθόη καὶ Ἀγαυὴ
 Δωτὴ τε Πρωτὴ τε Φέρουσά τε Δυναμένη τε
 Δεξαμένη τε καὶ Ἀμφινόμη καὶ Καλλιάνειρα
 Δωρίς καὶ Πανόπη καὶ ἀγακλειτὴ Γαλάτεια
 Νημερτὴς τε καὶ Ἀψευδῆς καὶ Καλλιάνασσα·
 ἔνθα δ' ἔην Κλυμένη Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα
 Μαῖρα καὶ Ὠρεῖθνια εὐπλόκαμός τ' Ἀμάθεια
 ἄλλαι θ' αἰ κατὰ βένθος ἀλὸς Νηρηίδες ἦσαν.

At first glance the verse in which the name Ἰάνασσα appears would seem to be unremarkable but for the pairing of names with a common first root (Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα), a feature not uncommon for epic catalogues.¹¹ However, there is a certain peculiarity about the formation of the names in that the scansion shows that the digamma was respected both in Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα, but at the same time, the first root in the two names appears with $\text{f}\bar{\iota}$ instead of the expected $\text{f}\bar{\iota}$. Obviously, the shortness of the first syllable $\text{f}\bar{\iota}$ can be explained by hiatus, and the epic poets seem to have had a certain degree of liberty in their treatment of the compound names with $\text{f}\bar{\iota}$ as the first root.¹² However, there is evidence

⁹ On the reception of the *Aethiopsis*, see Rengakos 2015, 306.

¹⁰ See Bartley 2009, 152–155; cf. Hopkinson 2008, 219.

¹¹ E.g. the pairing of Ἴπποθόη and Ἴππονόη in Hesiod's catalogue of Nereids (*Th.* 251, a pair that West 1966, 240 *ad loc.* compares with the pair Ναυσίθοος and Ναυσίνοος at *Th.* 1017–1018), as well as Κυμοδόκη and Κυματολήγη at *Th.* 255–256.

¹² Thus, the short $\text{f}\bar{\iota}$ is found in Ἰάνθη (*Hes. Th.* 349; *h. Hom. Dem.* 419); however, the names beginning with the instrumental form of $\text{f}\bar{\iota}$ always have the long $\text{f}\bar{\iota}$ –: cf. Ἰφιάνειρα (*Hes. fr.* 25. 39 Merkelbach–West), Ἰφιδάμας (*Il.* 11. 221 and 234); Ἰφικλῆς (*Il.* 2. 705; *Hes. fr.* 199. 5; etc.), Ἰφίνοος (*Il.* 7. 14) and Ἰφινόη (*Hes. fr.* 129. 24).

that the forms Ἴάνειρα and Ἴάνασσα (and in particular, the short initial vowel ἰ) caused uneasiness among the grammarians, so much so that Eustathius (*ad Il.* 18. 39 et 41 = vol. IV, 134 van der Valk) preserves an interpretation that preferred to derive the names from the verb ἰαίνω rather than from ἰς:¹³

Ἰστέον γὰρ ὅτι εἰσὶ τινὰ τῶν τοῦ ὕδατος, ἐξ ὧν ἐκάστου διάφορα τῶν τινες Νηρηίδων κοινοῦνται ὀνόματα, οἷον τὸ Ἰαιρα καὶ Ἴάνειρα καὶ Ἴάνασσα, ἴσως δὲ ἀκολούθως τοῖς δυσὶ τούτοις καὶ τὸ Καλλιάνειρα καὶ Καλλιάνασσα, παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνειν, ἐπεὶ τοιοῦτον τὸ στοιχεῖον εὐφρόσυνον δηλαδὴ πολυτρόπως.

According to Eustathius, Ἰαιρα, Ἴάνειρα and Ἴάνασσα, as well as Καλλιάνειρα and Καλλιάνασσα (that he manifestly segments Καλλ-ιάνειρα, Καλλ-ιάνασσα) derive from ἰαίνω: needless to say, this explanation violates the basic principles of compound name formation (this is glaring in the case of Καλλιάνειρα and Καλλιάνασσα). The reasoning behind etymology preserved by Eustathius may be reconstructed as follows. There could be two reasons behind the reluctance to acknowledge that the names Ἴάνειρα and Ἴάνασσα were compounds: a) the initial ἰ- in the names Ἴάνειρα and Ἴάνασσα is short, whereas if it were a separate root (ἰς), it would be expected to be long to show its distinctness; (b) Homer clearly wished Ἴάνειρα and Ἴάνασσα to counterbalance Καλλιάνειρα and Καλλιάνασσα, hence their formation must be identical; however, as compound names are expected to consist of two roots only, the second part of the names -ιάνειρα and -ιάνασσα would have to consist of a single root. If the names are considered as deriving from a single root ἰαν-, phonetically, the closest guess would be ἰαίνω ‘soothe’, a verb that happened to be suitable both semantically and morphologically. Admittedly, the case was stronger for Ἴάνειρα, than for Ἴάνασσα, but within an analogical framework Ἴάνασσα could be compared, e.g., to βασιλίσα (βασιλεύω : βασιλίσα :: ἰαίνω : Ἴάνασσα). Obviously, their resemblance to other feminine compound names, such as Κυδι-άνειρα, Λυσι-άνειρα, Λυσι-άνασσα, etc., had to be brushed aside.

It is clear, from the preservation and the presentation of this etymology in Eustathius, that it must have had, despite its evident deficiencies, an

¹³ For modern scholars it is self-evident that the first root of the two names is ἰς: thus, Edwards 1991, 150 (on *Il.* 18. 47): “Ianeira (also at *HyDem* 421) and Ianassa are both from ἰς, ‘strength,’ + fem. forms of -άνηρ, -ἄναξ”; von Kamptz 1982, 102 § 34 a 4; Schwyzer 1950, I, 452.

authoritative proponent among Alexandrian scholars;¹⁴ however, a part of the scholarly tradition might have questioned it, rightly interpreting the names as compounds (of the type Λυσι-άνειρα / Λυσι-άνασσα) with ἴς for the first root. Indeed, the derivation of Ἰάνειρα from ἰαίνω and the interpretation of the name as a feminine *nomen agentis* (as suggested by Eustathius) would have run counter to basic linguistic instincts of Greek speakers, even if it did have the advantage of eschewing the problem of the short ρ̄-, as well the issue of the inner form and semantics of the name.¹⁵ With regard to Ἰάνασσα, the dissociation of the name from the noun ἄνασσα would most certainly have appeared improbable to some ancient philologists. Eustathius, as well as his (probably Hellenistic)¹⁶ source, was primarily stressing the parallelism between the composite names Καλλιάνειρα – Καλλιάνασσα (both appearing at the end of the hexameter in v. 44 and v. 46) and Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα of v. 47: they do in fact share a parallel formation, and the choice of the second root points to the social domain rather than to the marine.¹⁷ Now, the name Ἰάνειρα appears elsewhere in archaic poetry,¹⁸ and had to be retained without change, but Ἰάνασσα, which was not attested in the epics and was more difficult to reconcile with the derivation from ἰαίνω, could be modified. I would

¹⁴ Eustathius repeats this etymology at another point of his commentary, as he cites Ianeira as a parallel for the Sicilians' calling the sea "sweet": ὁ καὶ σημείωσαι εἰς τὸ Ἰάνειρα. ὅπερ ὄνομά ἐστι Νηρηίδος ἐν Ἰλιάδι, ταυτοδύναμον τῷ Ἰάνασσα, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰαίνω τὸ εὐφραίνω εἴπου γλυκαίνω (Eust. *ad Od.* 4. 511 = vol. I, 178).

¹⁵ Cf. B. Mader in *LfggrE* 1955–2010, II, 1106, s.v. Ἰάνειρα: "der intendierte Sinn des Namens bleibt dann allerdings unklar (einfach formal analogisch zu Ἰάνασσα gebildet und Bedeutung etwa die starke Männer hervorbringt)".

¹⁶ M. van der Valk 1971–1987, IV, 134 in his *apparatus criticus* notes, with regard to Eustathius' commentary on Μελίτη, "e fonte [...] vox γλυκασμός iam aetate Hellenistica reperitur, fortasse hausta est e fonte". As Eustathius in his overview of the Nereid names groups them semantically, and as the explanation given for the name Μελίτη is contingent with the etymology ἰαίνω 'soothe, rejoice' proposed for Ἰαιρα, Ἰάνειρα and Ἰάνασσα, it is probable that both stem from Alexandrian scholarship. It is worth mentioning that Μελίτη and Ἰαιρα appear side by side in v. 42, and their juxtaposition in Homer's text would have suggested the idea that their names belong to the same semantic field.

¹⁷ Cf. Edwards 1991, 148: "seven [names] are suitable for high-ranking women (Iaira, Amphinome, Kallianeira, Kallianassa, Klumene, Ianeira, Ianassa)".

¹⁸ In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* Ianeira appears in the list of Oceanids who were by Persephone's side when she was abducted: Χρυσήϊς τ' Ἰάνειρά τ' Ἀκάστη τ' Ἀδμήτη τε... (421). Occurrence of the same name in lists of Nereids and of Oceanids is fairly common, as M. L. West has noted (see West 1966, 237 on Hes. *Th.* 241): for example, in the same list of Persephone's companions Μελίτη who appeared in Homer and Hesiod as a Nereid (*Il.* 18. 42 and *Th.* 247) appears as an Oceanid in *h. Hom. Dem.* 419.

like to suggest that some scholars might have considered breaking up the symmetry and reconstructing, instead of Ἰάνασσα, a variant that was more viable from the point of view of name formation and metrics, Ἰφιάνασσα, with the first root taken in its instrumental form (cf. the syntagm ἴφι ἀνάσσειν).¹⁹ In *Il.* 18. 47 this change would only involve omitting one of the conjunctions between the two names (preferably τε, so that the verse would probably have read *Κλυμένη, Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα or even *κλυμένη Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα).²⁰ Alternatively, Ἰφιάνασσα might have appeared in *Il.* 18. 47 not as a scholarly correction, but as a scribal *lapsus calami* under the influence of *Il.* 9. 145 and 287 where the name of Agamemnon's daughter appeared in the same position at the end of the verse.²¹

It is important to stress that there is nothing impossible in the idea that Lucian could preserve a Homeric reading that left no other trace in Homeric manuscripts and the papyri. We have at least two other examples when Homer is quoted by Lucian with a variant reading that is not attested elsewhere.²² Thus, in *Charon*, the ferryman tells the story of how Homer, as he was sailing on his boat, started singing from *Odyssey* 5, conjuring an actual storm around them (Luc. *Char.* 7):

ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἤρξατο ἄδειν οὐ πᾶν αἰσιόν τινα ᾠδὴν τοῖς πλέουσιν, ὡς ὁ Ποσειδῶν συνήγαγε τὰς νεφέλας καὶ ἐτάραξε τὸν πόντον ὥσπερ τορύνῃν τινὰ ἐμβάλων τὴν τρίαιναν καὶ πάσας τὰς θυέλλας ὠρόθηνε καὶ ἄλλα πολλά, κυκῶν τὴν θάλατταν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπῶν, χειμῶν ἄφνω καὶ γνόφος ἐμπροσθῶν ὀλίγου δεῖν περιέτρεψεν ἡμῖν τὴν ναῦν· ὅτε περ καὶ ναυτιάσας ἐκεῖνος ἀπήμισε τῶν βαψφιδῶν τὰς πολλὰς αὐτῇ Σκύλλῃ καὶ Χαρύβδει καὶ Κύκλωπι...

¹⁹ Thus, Chantraine 1968–1977, 469, s.v. 1 ἴς : “[ἴς] s’emploie à l’instrumental ἴφι avec les verbes ἀνάσσειν, μαχέσθαι, δαμῆναι, et le participe κτάμενος”, and von Kamptz 1982, 85, § 29 b 1. The expression ἴφι ἀνάσσειν occurs at *Il.* 1. 38 and 452; 6. 478; *Od.* 11. 284; 17. 443; for a similar name formation, cf. the masculine name Ἰφιδάμας based on ἴφι δαμάζειν (cf. *Il.* 19. 417; 21. 208; *Od.* 18. 57 and 156).

²⁰ As for the non-observance of the digamma before Iphianassa's name in this reconstruction of the verse, cf. the list of Agamemnon daughters, Χρυσόθεμις καὶ Λαοδίκη καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα (*Il.* 9. 145 = 9. 287).

²¹ Naturally, scholarly corrections and genuine variants are not always easy to distinguish (see recently Montanari 2015, with discussion of earlier scholarship on the subject).

²² These examples were discovered through a thorough search of the *apparatus criticus* of M. L. West's editions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (West 1998–2000 and West 2017); a thorough search of Lucian's *œuvre* for the accuracy of Homeric quotations might yield other examples.

The passage is a close rendering in prose, though peppered with expressions from Homer, of the description of the sea-storm in which Odysseus almost perished (*Od.* 5. 291–293):

ὡς εἰπὼν σύναγεν νεφέλας, ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον
 χερσὶ τρίαιναν ἑλών· πάσας δ' ὀρόθυνεν ἀέλλας
 παντοίων ἀνέμων ...

After the exactness with which verses 291–292 are rendered,²³ it is startling to see Lucian deviate from Homer's text, as we know it, in *πάσας τὰς θυέλλας ὀρόθυνε* (cf. *ὀρόθυνεν ἀέλλας* in *Od.* 5. 292). However, in Homer *θύελλα* and *ἄελλα* function as semantically equivalent metrical variants,²⁴ and as the modification of expression in Lucian entailed no change of content, M. L. West suggested in his *apparatus criticus* that Lucian's copy of Homer might have read *ὀρόθυνε θυέλλας*.²⁵ This is indeed quite likely: Charon in this episode is depicted as eagerly picking up and storing away in his memory verses that Homer “vomited” (*ἀπήμεσε*), and while the addition of *ὥσπερ τορύνην τινὰ ἐμβάλων* would characterize him as an enthusiastic, but unrefined audience, the change of Homer's *πάσας δ' ὀρόθυνεν ἀέλλας* to *πάσας τὰς θυέλλας ὀρόθυνε* does not seem to be deliberate.²⁶

An even more straightforward example occurs in *De saltatione* 23,²⁷ as Lucian quotes Polydamas' speech from *Iliad* 13 to show that even Homer considered the dance *ἀμύμων*:

ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ὅμηρος τὰ ἥδιστα καὶ κάλλιστα καταλέγων, ὕπνον καὶ φιλότητα καὶ μολπὴν καὶ ὄρχησιν, μόνην ταύτην ἀμύμονα ὠνόμασεν, προσμαρτυρήσας νῆ Δία καὶ τὸ ἥδὺ τῆ μολπῆ, ἅπερ ἀμφοτέρα τῆ ὄρχηστικῆ πρόσεστιν, καὶ ὦδὴ γλυκερὰ καὶ ὄρχησμός ἀμύμων, ὃν σὺ νῦν μωμᾶσθαι ἐπινοεῖς. καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ μέρει τῆς ποιήσεως·

²³ Cf. *συνήγαγε τὰς νεφέλας*, cf. *σύναγεν νεφέλας* in Homer; *ἐτάραξε τὸν πόντον*, cf. *ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον*; Homer's *χερσὶ τρίαιναν ἑλών* is amplified by a humorous simile *ὥσπερ τορύνην τινὰ ἐμβάλων τὴν τρίαιναν*.

²⁴ The noun *θύελλα* was used after words ending with a short vowel, and *ἄελλα* used after words ending in a consonant or sonant: cf. *ἴσος ἀέλλη* (*Il.* 11. 297; 12. 40), but *ἀνέμοιο θύελλα* (*Il.* 6. 346; 12. 263, etc.), *φέρην πόντονδε θύελλα* (*Od.* 10. 48). The noun *ἄελλα* could also appear when there was need of shortening the long ending of the preceding word: cf. *ἀναρπάξασαι ἄελλαι* (*Od.* 8. 409), but *ἀναρπάξασα θύελλα* (*Od.* 4. 515; 5. 419).

²⁵ West 2017, 111: “ὀρόθυνε θυέλλας fort. legit Luc.”

²⁶ On this passage, see Kim 2010, 16.

²⁷ Lucian's authorship of the dialogue *De saltatione* has sometimes been doubted, but see Anderson 1977.

ἄλλω μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολεμήϊα ἔργα,
 ἄλλω δ' ὄρχηστὺν τε καὶ ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδίην.
 ἱμερόεσσα γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἢ μετ' ὄρχήσεως ᾠδή καὶ δῶρον θεῶν τοῦτο
 κάλλιστον.

In the phrase that follows the Homeric quotation, Lucian especially insists that it is not simply the dance, but the unison of song and dance that is a divine gift. However, in Homer (*Il.* 13. 730–731) the second hemistich of v. 731 has a different reading:

ἄλλω μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολεμήϊα ἔργα,
 ἄλλω δ' ὄρχηστὺν, ἑτέρω κίθαριν καὶ ἀοιδίην.

V. 731 was suspected by ancient scholars of being an interpolation, but the passage, due to its aphoristic nature, seems to have been fairly well known; however, Lucian is the only author to quote v. 731 as he does.²⁸ In Homer's text the song was separated from the dance (ἄλλω... ἑτέρω...); but the remark ἱμερόεσσα γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἢ μετ' ὄρχήσεως ᾠδή shows that Lucian was sufficiently certain of the text he was quoting, so that the idea of a misquotation may be dismissed. In his quotation the second part of v. 731 is replaced with a formulaic expression that is used twice in the *Odyssey* in this exact form and in combination with ὄρχηστὺν: οἱ δ' εἰς ὄρχηστὺν τε καὶ ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδίην / τρεψάμενοι τέρποντο... (*Od.* 1. 421–422 and 18. 304–305). The replacement of one formula by a related formula is a phenomenon that occurs regularly in Homeric manuscripts, and it is highly probable that Lucian's copy had a reading of v. 731 that is not attested elsewhere.

These two examples show that the text of Homer used by Lucian did carry variant readings that were not necessarily reflected in the Homeric manuscript tradition, and a variant reading of a similar kind could very well be behind the name of the Nereid Ἰφιάνασσα in *DMar.* 14. The suggestion that Ἰφιάνασσα was an ancient variant reading for Ἰάνασσα in *Il.* 18. 47 does not, of course, mean that it should be preferred over the reading preserved by the manuscripts. Indeed, Ἰφιάνασσα would produce two problems: (a) it would destroy the symmetry between the name pairs Καλλιάνειρα and Καλλιάνασσα (vv. 44 and 46) and Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ

²⁸ These lines are also quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4. 133. 2; the text of the quotation corresponds to the Homeric vulgate). V. 731, bracketed by West, was rejected by Aristarchus, but defended by Zenodotus of Mallos (the exegetical scholia even say that he invented the verse); see also Janko 1992, 138. Rengakos 1993, 125–126, referring to Call. *Hymn.* 1. 70–73, shows that v. 731 seems to have been known to Callimachus.

Ἰάνασσα (v. 47) in the Homeric catalogue; (b) it would create a misleading association with Agamemnon's daughter Iphianassa (Iphigeneia). Both points placed the reading Ἰφιάνασσα at a disadvantage with regard to Ἰάνασσα, and, since scholars who defended Ἰάνασσα could also refer to the etymology from ἰαίνω proposed for the name (along with Ἰαίρα and Ἰάνασσα), it is not surprising that the correction left no trace in the manuscript tradition.

If we recognize that Lucian was relying on the Homeric catalogue of the Nereids for the name Ἰφιάνασσα, the divergence from the form Ἰάνασσα being due to a variant reading in his copy, the choice of the name might have had a polemic side to it. While Lucian was certainly looking for a name that would indicate her authority among her sisters, Iphianassa is the only Nereid in the *Dialogi marini* that can be traced back exclusively to the Homeric catalogue of the Nereids (Doris appearing in both catalogues). Lucian might have indicated, by his choice of the name Ἰφιάνασσα, his trust in the authenticity of Homer's catalogue against Zenodotus and Aristarchus who had proposed to athetize the list of Nereids altogether on the grounds that it was 'Hesiodic in character':²⁹ after all, in his imagined conversation with Homer in the *True Histories*, Lucian asks Homer whether the verses athetized by Alexandrian scholars had been written by him, and the poet replies that all lines were his.³⁰

Maria N. Kazanskaya
Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS
subura@mail.ru

Bibliography

- G. Anderson, "Lucian and the Authorship of *De saltatione*", *GRBS* 18 (1977) 275–286.
A. N. Bartley (ed., comm.), *Lucian's Dialogi Marini* (Newcastle upon Tyne 2009).
P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : histoire des mots* (Paris 1968–1977).

²⁹ *Schol. A ad Il.* 18. 39–49: Ὁ τῶν Νηρείδων χορὸς προηθέτηται καὶ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ ὡς Ἡσιόδ<ε>ιον ἔχων χαρακτηρᾶ· Ὅμηρος γὰρ κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν Μούσας λέγει καὶ Εἰλειθυίας, ἀλλ' οὐκ ὀνόματα· γελοῖόν τε ἐξ ὀνόματος προθέμενον εἰπεῖν πάσας, ὡσπερ ἀποκαμόντα εἰπεῖν "ἄλλαι θ' αἱ κατὰ βένθος ἄλῳς Νηρηίδες ἦσαν". The phrase καὶ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ shows that Aristarchus and his school agreed with this athetesis.

³⁰ Cf. Luc. *VH* 2. 20: ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀθετουμένων στίχων ἐπρωτότων, εἰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰσι γεγραμμένοι. καὶ ὃς ἔφασκε πάντας αὐτοῦ εἶναι. κατεγίνωσκον οὖν τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Ζηνόδοτον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον γραμματικῶν πολλῆν τὴν ψυχρολογίαν. For a detailed analysis of this episode, see Kim 2010, 162–168.

- B. Currie, *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford 2016).
- M. Davies, *The Aethiopsis: Neo-Neanalyzis Reanalyzed* (Washington, DC – Cambridge, MA – London 2016).
- M. W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary V: Books 17–20* (Cambridge – New York 1991).
- B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary III: Books 9–12* (Cambridge – New York 1993).
- N. Hopkinson (ed., comm.), *Lucianus: A Selection* (Cambridge – New York 1991).
- R. Janko (comm.), *The Iliad: A Commentary IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge – New York 1992).
- J. Th. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (Lund 1949).
- H. von Kamptz, *Homeric Personennamen: Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation* (Göttingen 1982).
- N. Kanavou, *The Names of Homeric Heroes: Problems and Interpretations* (Berlin–Boston 2015).
- L. Kim, *Homer Between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature* (Cambridge – New York 2010).
- Fr. Krafft, *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod* (Göttingen 1963).
- Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos I–IV [= LfgrE]* (Göttingen 1955–2010).
- M. D. Macleod (ed.), *Luciani Opera IV* (Oxford 1987).
- Fr. Montanari, “Aristarchus’ Conjectures (Once) Again”, in: M. Tziatzi, M. Billerbeck, F. Montanari, K. Tsantsanoglou (eds.), *Lemmata: Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis* (Berlin–Boston 2015) 119–129.
- G. Nagy, “Iphigeneia and Iphianassa”, *Classical Inquiries* 2017.01.12 (URL: <https://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/iphigeneia-and-iphianassa>).
- Th. G. Palaima, “Wanaks and Related Power Terms in Mycenaean and Later Greek”, in: S. Deger-Jalkotzy, I. S. Lemos (eds.), *Ancient Greece from the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer* (Edinburgh 2006) 53–72.
- A. Rengakos, *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter* (Stuttgart 1993).
- A. Rengakos, “Aethiopsis”, in: M. Fantuzzi, Chr. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and Its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge 2015) 306–317.
- E. I. Robbins, *Thalia Delighting in Song: Essays on Ancient Greek Poetry* (Toronto–Buffalo–London 2013).
- E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik I* (Munich 1953).
- M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes I–IV* (Leiden – New York – Copenhagen – Köln 1971–1987).
- M. L. West (ed.), *Homeri Ilias I–II* (Munich–Leipzig 1998–2000).
- M. L. West, “Iliad and Aethiopsis”, *CQ* 53 (2003) 1–14.
- M. L. West, *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford – New York 2011).
- M. L. West (ed.), *Homerus, Odyssea* (Berlin–Boston 2017).
- M. Wright, *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies. A Study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians* (Oxford – New York 2005).

The article examines Lucian's source for the name of the Nereid in *DMar.* 14, Iphianassa (Ἰφιάνασσα). This name does not appear in the two classical lists of Nereids in Homer (*Il.* 18. 37–49) and in Hesiod (*Th.* 240–264), from which Lucian drew the names of all other Nereids of his *Dialogi marini*, and Lucian is the sole ancient source to mention a Nereid by that name. This led scholars to suspect that the name may be due to a *lapsus memoriae* or to Lucian's use of a corrupt text, or that it might have even been invented by him. The article shows that, as with other Nereids, the name must go back to the Homeric or Hesiodic catalogue of the Nereids, and that Ἰφιάνασσα could be due to a variant reading in Lucian's copy of the *Iliad* that had *Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα instead of Homer's Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα (*Il.* 18. 47). This would not be the only example that Lucian preserves a reading otherwise unattested in the Homeric manuscripts (cf. his quotation of *Il.* 13. 731 in *De salt.* 23 and his rendering of *Od.* 5. 292 in *Char.* 7).

В статье разбирается вопрос о том, на какой источник опирался Лукиан при выборе имени Ифианасса (Ἰφιάνασσα) для nereиды из *DMar.* 14. Это имя не встречается в двух классических каталогах nereид у Гомера (*Il.* 18. 37–49) и у Гесиода (*Th.* 240–264), к которым восходят имена всех остальных nereид в его *Морских диалогах*. Более того, Лукиан является единственным античным автором, который упоминает о существовании nereиды с таким именем: это вызвало подозрения у издателей Лукиана, что он мог опираться на испорченный текст, мог неправильно вспомнить или даже просто изобрести это имя. В статье показывается, что имя Ифианассы должно было восходить либо к гомеровскому, либо к гесиодовскому каталогу nereид и что Ἰφιάνασσα, вероятно, объясняется разночтением в лукиановском экземпляре *Илиады*: *Ἰάνειρα καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα вместо Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα (*Il.* 18. 47). Это был бы не единственный случай, когда Лукиан приводит гомеровский текст с разночтением, которое не засвидетельствовано в гомеровских рукописях (ср. цитату *Il.* 13. 731 в *De salt.* 23 и прозаическую передачу *Od.* 5. 292 в *Char.* 7).

Svetlana Dubova

APULEIUS' VENUS AND SPEECH CHARACTERIZATION

Being one of the main characters of Apuleius' story, Venus has long attracted the attention of numerous scholars, and it seems there is always more to uncover. The image of Venus is crucial for the story of Cupid and Psyche: not only is she a very vivid and memorable character, but she is also the driving force behind the plot.

As the main antagonist she is opposed to Psyche from the early beginning: Venus is the first name mentioned in the story, even though it is used to compare Psyche with the goddess of love and beauty or, more specifically, to stress the sense of awe inspired by both of them: *ut ipsam prorsus deam Venerem <venerabantur>* (*Met.* 4. 28. 3).¹ Being attracted to Psyche, people forget about venerating the real goddess. Venus delivers an ireful speech about the girl's shamelessness (the first example of direct discourse in the story of Cupid and Psyche) and asks Cupid to make her fall in love with the worst mortal of all. At this point, the reader knows all three main characters, but Venus is the one who is described most thoroughly: we see her reasoning, the way she talks and acts (*capite quassanti, gemens ac fremens indignatione*). Psyche and Cupid have only been mentioned briefly and serve as a cause for Venus' rage and means to soothe it.

Venus quits the stage and does not appear till the end of Book V, where a seagull, the goddess' servant, tells her that her son suffers from the wound inflicted by Psyche. Venus does not care about her son's well-being but is enraged by Cupid's misbehavior. The goddess employs Mercury's assistance to find Psyche and gives her impossible tasks, including the descent into the underworld – a sure way to get rid of the girl for good. Cupid helps his beloved and persuades Jupiter to solve their

¹ There can be little doubt that either *venerabantur* or the historic infinitive of non-deponent *venerare* should be supplemented in the text, as most editors agree (Zimmerman *et al.* 2004, 45). *Venus* and *venerari* share the same root, and instances of this figura etymologica are found already in Plautus, one of the favorite sources of Apuleius (Nicolini 2011, 49–50).

problems; Jupiter assures Venus that she does not have to worry about her association with the mortal and makes Psyche a goddess. Venus does not answer and remains mute for the rest of the story, but we should assume her rage ceased, and the end of her anger marks the end of the story.

It is evident that the position of Venus' first speech is textually prominent: she is the first character to talk, and her long and furious oration sets the main conflict and promises an interesting unravelling of the plot. Venus comes back at the end of Book V with another extended speech, after which she is the last person to leave the scene. She does not particularly stand out in Book VI, even though she appears more often there. At the end of the story she is mentioned among other gods and goddesses celebrating Cupid and Psyche's wedding.²

It has long been noted that Apuleius pays a lot of attention to the stylistic shaping of the text: from the elaborate choice of words to careful composition. Since Venus is one of the main characters and the importance of her words is stressed by a meaningful textual position, it is tempting to trace how Venus' way of speaking is different from other characters'. A character's voice can be a very important tool for creating a vivid and believable image. It may consist of typical words and phrases, mannerisms, a vocabulary of particular stylistic coloring, syntactic nuances. As Sarah Parker observes,³ Apuleius does not provide explicit characterization for Venus: her story and her attributes are well-known to the public, and Apuleius is not interested in restating the obvious. The author gives plenty of implicit characteristics for the goddess which create a character that can be easily described: jealous, emotional, self-centered, cruel, and vindictive. These are the traits that we figure out based on her behavior, her actions, and the content of her speeches. The way Venus talks is much less straightforward and thus needs to be discussed.

For us (as non-native Latin speakers) character's voice is particularly hard to grasp. Still, it has long been known that some characters from the Latin literature do stand out by their special manner of speech. The

² The textually prominent positions of Venus' speeches in Books IV and V were already pointed out by Sarah Parker in her work dedicated to Apuleius' techniques of description in *Cupid and Psyche* (Parker 1999, 173 and 194–195). She explains the decrease of Venus' prominence and significance by the fact that Psyche's meeting the goddess shifts the focus of the story to the girl's ability to complete the tasks. From this point, the plot is mainly driven not by Venus' rage (though Venus is still indignant at Psyche), but by Psyche's challenge. S. Parker (*ibid.*, 201–202) also highlights that Apuleius carefully selected the words describing Venus and her actions (a great deal of them are emotionally loaded and are important for grasping Venus' state). Unfortunately, she does not pay attention to the stylistic nuances in her analysis.

³ Parker 1999, 173.

first work that comes to mind is *the Feast of Trimalchio*. Trimalchio's pretentious speech is different from his guests' speeches: while their Latin seems crude and vulgar, Trimalchio is intentionally trying (and still failing) to show grandeur in the way he speaks. Though he makes the same mistakes (like vulgarisms and incorrect grammatical structures), his speech is also characterized by hypercorrection.⁴ Petronius represents the low-class speech more accurately and consistently than Plautus, and the voice of slaves and freedmen in *the Feast of Trimalchio* has long been a favourite topic for scholars.⁵ The difference between the narrator's and characters' voices clearly shows that their Latinity depends on their social and/or geographical background, as well as other factors, like education and the will to seem more learned than the character actually is.⁶ Petronius was not the first Latin author to distinguish the characters' speeches. Though Plautus' works do resemble the everyday conversations of slaves, a more 'personal' approach can be observed in Cicero's *De oratore*. Cicero attempted to represent speeches of Crassus and Antonius regarding their word choice, sentences' length and structure, and even rhythmic patterns.⁷ Overall, speech characterization is a long-familiar but quite rare phenomenon in the Latin literature. As J. N. Adams puts it, such prominent usages are occasional and of a miscellaneous character,⁸ but a careful investigation can lead to trustworthy results in portrayed speech analysis of a certain social group (like the freedmen in Petronius). This is possible mainly because we can compare freedmen's speeches with the language of the narrator and other characters within the same book. Can something similar be observed in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*?

Even though the exact date of the composition of the novel is unknown, Apuleius certainly wrote the *Metamorphoses* long after Plautus and

⁴ Boyce 1991, 98–101. Trimalchio is not the only character of the *Satyricon* whose speech can be pointed out as highly artificial and intentionally literary. Peter George names the same traits regarding the figure of Giton: George 1966, 339–342.

⁵ A comprehensive list of works on the topic can be found in Schmeling 2011, XXV–XXX.

⁶ Age can influence the way a character talks as well. It has been noted that elderly characters in comedy use archaic forms more often: Karakasis 2005, 60–61. Cicero's Crassus also points out that his wife's mother speaks in a way which resembles Plautus and Naevius (*De orat.* 3. 12. 45): from his point of view, women preserve the ancient language more easily as they do not spend much time in conversation with others. Besides, the state of inebriation can be emphasized by the character's speech: Abbott 1907, 49–50.

⁷ Mankin 2011, 41–48; Albrecht 2003, 92–94.

⁸ Adams 2013, 17.

some time after Petronius. Both authors are often compared to Apuleius: he undoubtedly read Plautus' plays and used them as a source for the vocabulary, and the *Metamorphoses* is the second known Latin novel after the *Satyricon*. Moreover, both novels are influenced by the genre of the Milesian tale, although it is problematic to determine its influence in terms of language and style. As Plautus and, to a greater extent, Petronius tried to frame their characters' speeches in a distinguished way, it would be tempting to see something similar in Apuleius. His characters do indeed use some words and expressions which are consistent with their social role: a soldier vernacularly puts *ubi* for *quo*, when he asks a gardener, where he is going with the ass (*ubi ducis asinum istum? Met. 9. 39. 4*);⁹ an oracle uses archaic and elevated nominative *Iovis* (*tremis ipse Iovis, Met. 4. 33. 2*); speeches of the slave girl Photis are full of diminutives, which are peculiar to colloquial language (*miselle, foculo, igniculus, lectulum* – all in one phrase, *Met. 2. 7. 7*). The problem is that Apuleius uses such words throughout the novel at random. When we first meet Photis, she makes short and somewhat blunt remarks (*Met. 1. 22. 2–5*), but this style is not consistent with her later speeches (see, for example, *Met. 2. 17. 3*). Lucius uses all kinds of stylistically colored words irrespectively of the context. Many scholars have noted that the story of Cupid and Psyche is put into the mouth of a drunken old woman, but the language of the story is in fact rich, detailed, and poetic (not much different from the rest of the novel).¹⁰ Apuleius writes that Psyche is struggling with words and stutters (*tertiata verba semihianti voce substrepens, Met. 5. 18. 5*), but she delivers a perfectly articulate and balanced speech.¹¹ All things considered, it seems that Apuleius did not intend to grant his characters a special manner of speech.

Plautus is not the only source of influence for Apuleius. One of his favorite writers was Virgil, a poet attractive for many archaizing authors despite his rather balanced style lacking an inclination for archaism.¹² It is hard to overestimate Virgil's influence on the posterior literature,

⁹ Callebaut 1968, 196; Adams 2013, 333.

¹⁰ Kenney 1990, 22–24; George 1966, 343. Nevertheless, some scholars find that the personality of the *anus* affects the description of the events and characters to some degree: van Mal-Maeder – Zimmerman 1998, 84–93; van Mal-Maeder 2015, 148–151.

¹¹ Zimmerman *et al.* 2004, 246 also provides an illustration of independence of Psyche's speeches from her emotions in *Met. 5. 13*, where she "*suscipit... singultu lacrimoso sermonem incertans*", but the following speech is clear.

¹² On Apuleius' use of Virgil's motifs see Frangoulidis 1990, Finkelppearl 1998, Harrison 2013.

and Apuleius for sure turned to Virgil's legacy while working on the *Metamorphoses* and the story of Cupid and Psyche in particular. Aside from several Virgilian reminiscences, we can clearly see Juno from the *Aeneid* in Apuleius' Venus.¹³ The similarities are numerous: both stories begin with the goddesses' monologues expressing resentment, they wreak their anger on the mortal protagonist, they both discontentedly refer to the Judgement of Paris, both are concerned about their cult, both employ Cupid to help with their plan and seek assistance from other gods (Aeolus and Allecto in Virgil, Mercury in Apuleius), both goddesses' anger drives the plot, in the end their plans collapse, and Jupiter persuades them to give up. Even though the images of the goddesses are so similar, the words in their opening speeches are quite different, granted the difference of genres. As expected, we find several poetic words in Juno's soliloquy (*furias, rates, aequora*: Verg. *Aen.* 1. 37–49), while Apuleius' Venus uses more formal expressions (*partiaro maiestate honore tractor, communi numinis piamento, vicariae venerationis incertum, inlicitiae formonsitatis*: Apul. *Met.* 4. 30. 1–5). Throughout the whole story, Venus is very concerned with legalities, which is clearly shown from the early beginning. As L. R. Palmer observes, religious and legal language carefully preserves archaic forms, which is in line with several words in the novel (for example, *ariolor* in *Met.* 2. 7. 2, *primigenius* in *Met.* 11. 5. 2, *succidaneus* in *Met.* 8. 26. 3), including the adjective *partarius*, used by Venus (before Apuleius only attested in Cato). Venus finishes her speech with a menacing archaism *faxo*, which has the same solemn and sinister tone in the *Aeneid* (when Turnus revives his army's spirits and promises to show all their might to the Troians in *Aen.* 9. 154 and when Aeneas is going to kill Turnus in *Aen.* 12. 316–317). Virgil also seems to use archaisms speaking of gods and translating their message to give their voices more grandeur.¹⁴ It is important to remember that archaic vocabulary was considered peculiar to poetic genres (Cic. *De orat.* 3. 38. 153), so there was a tradition to use archaic words for embellishment. Virgil quite often makes use of the archaic plural in *-um* and *-ai* and does not shy away from such words as *infit* and *quianam* which were avoided in prose. Apuleius' love for archaism, on the other hand, cannot be explained by specific genre traits. As is commonly known, Apuleius enjoys a variety of different

¹³ Tatum 1979, 49–50; Finkelppearl 1990, 345; Kenney 1990, 121; Parker 1999, 182–194; Elford 2011, 108–117; Brant 2016, 103–104.

¹⁴ Examples can be found in Marouzeau 1946, 180; Palmer 1954, 112–113; Kashima 2017, 9.

stylistically colored words, and some scholars attempted to link them to the context in some cases.¹⁵

Apuleius' Venus does not say a lot of archaic words. Aside from already mentioned *partiaris* and *faxo*, she asks Cupid to punish Psyche *severiter*¹⁶ (*Met.* 4. 31. 2, before Apuleius this adverb was attested only in a fragment of Titinius), tells Mercury that she needs to put out a search for Psyche *publicitus* (6. 7. 3, an adverb used by many archaic poets and fallen back into use after Gellius) and promises Psyche that she will treat her *ut bonam nurum condecet* (6. 9. 2, a verb used by comic writers before Apuleius). Besides, she uses the archaic ablative *qui* in *Met.* 6. 7. 4 and calls her servant *Tristities* (6. 9. 2, a rare form with archaic flavor). One can also mention the archaic future forms of the imperatives *esto* (6. 9. 2), *approbato* (6. 10. 3), *dicito* (6. 16. 4), and *redito* (6. 16. 5). These forms usually occur in legal and technical contexts, as well as in comedy.¹⁷ In the story of Cupid and Psyche, future imperatives are used by gods (Cupid, Jupiter, mostly Venus) and the talking tower. Venus' actions are also occasionally described with words which give an archaic touch: she speaks to her son *boans*¹⁸ (5. 29. 1), after her conversation with Juno and Ceres she leaves *alterorsus*¹⁹ (5. 31. 7), talks with Mercury *petitu*²⁰ *superbo* (6. 7. 1, before Gellius and Apuleius this noun was attested only in Lucretius, though with a different meaning, 'moving forward'), after Psyche's first trial she *cubitum facessit* (6. 11. 2, an archaic verb frequently used by Apuleius in the novel). When she comes back and addresses Psyche, Apuleius uses the verb *infit* (6. 11. 4), a poetic word with archaic color. Juno and Ceres describe Venus as *cordata mulier* (5. 31. 5), mocking her with this distinctly Ennian adjective. In the end of

¹⁵ For example, L. Callebat describes several instances when Apuleian archaic words are used as elements of literary parody and as a means to develop comedic themes (Callebat 1965, 346–361). The latter was also explored by R. May (May 2007, 39–43).

¹⁶ An attractive conjecture by Brantius instead of F's reading *reverenter*. Both options make good sense and are accepted by various editors.

¹⁷ Hofmann–Szantyr 1972, 340–341; Callebat 1968, 502–503.

¹⁸ *Boare* is a poetic word attested since Ennius, Pacuvius, and Plautus. Apuleius uses it 3 times in his novel (5. 29. 1; 7. 3. 4; 9. 20. 4), always in mockery.

¹⁹ The adverb *alterorsus* (emendation of a *vir doctus* in edition by F. van Oudendorp in place of F' *alte rursus*) is attested only in Apuleius (here and in *Met.* 9. 28. 1). However, a similar adverb *altrovorsum* is attested in Plautus' *Casina* (555). *TLL* gives these two words together and does not list any other instances, so it is likely that Apuleius' *alterorsus* must have had a Plautine flavor.

²⁰ The noun probably belongs to legal language (Apuleius used it in court, see *Apol.* 45. 1; 48. 11), it is also frequent in inscriptions.

the story all gods are celebrating, and Venus organizes the entertainment to her own taste (*scaena sibi sic concinnata*, 6. 24. 3), so Muses sing and Satyr with Paniscus provide the music. *Concinnare* (a favorite word of Plautus and Apuleius) is a relatively rare verb and can be considered archaic (although it existed in all periods of Latin literature, it was avoided by classical writers).²¹

As demonstrated, we can see a variety of archaic words either used by Venus or describing her and her actions. That being said, it is essential to remember that archaisms are dispersed throughout the whole novel, and their number in this particular case does not play a major role. The important part is the surprise effect. It was already mentioned by ancient authors that an unexpected word can have a great influence on the readers. Fronto, one of the main figures of the archaizing movement, complained about the lack of archaisms in Cicero's writings for the very reason that one could not find many *insperata atque inopinata verba* (Fronto, *Ep. ad M. Caesarem* 4. 3). Quintilian also mentions the effect of novelty produced by such words (*Inst.* 1. 6. 39). In the archaists' time, poets like Ennius and Lucretius were studied precisely to snatch unique and striking words from their writings.²² Apuleius relies too heavily on this effect, so the constant changing of different stylistically colored words obliterates it completely. That makes it even more valuable when an archaic word is indeed unexpected. This is the case with Venus' soliloquy at the beginning of the story of Cupid and Psyche. Apuleius starts by describing the faraway kingdom and the beauty of Psyche. Although the introduction to the story does not lack words and forms unusual for prose (e.g. a poetic ending of *habuere* and a rare adverb with a legal tinge *idonee* in 4. 28. 1), there is no word that is specifically archaic.²³ Then Venus enters the stage. She soliloquizes in elevated style; her first sentence is undeniably Lucretian: *en rerum naturae prisca parens, en elementorum origo initialis, en orbis totius alma Venus, quae cum mortali puella partiario maiestatis honore*

²¹ Zimmerman *et al.* 2004, 551.

²² Zimmerman 2006, 318.

²³ To determine whether a word is archaic or not, is a problem of its own. More precisely put, at the beginning of the story we cannot find a word which was attested in the writings of archaic authors and avoided by classical ones. Understandably, nothing certain can be said about those words which are first attested in Apuleius, as it is possible that they are not neologisms, but words from the archaic or colloquial language, and every word should be regarded individually. At the start of the story of Cupid and Psyche (before Venus' first appearance), there are only two such words: *sufficier* (4. 28. 2) and *incoronatus* (4. 29. 3). *Sufficier* is also attested in Ulpian and some Christian authors, *incoronatus* is a hapax.

tractor.²⁴ The solemn effect is enhanced by legal wording and first archaisms in the story.²⁵ Both manner and matter of the speech show that this is one of the crucial episodes in the story. An even more prominent example can be found in Book VI. When all gods assemble in the theatre to discuss the events of the story, Jupiter delivers a speech about his intention to marry Cupid and Psyche (*Met.* 6. 23). His speech towards the assembly takes up 8 lines, where Jupiter does not make use of a single archaism. After that, he delivers 3 lines directly to Venus, and they definitely have an archaic flavor (6. 2. 4):

Et ad Venerem conlata facie, 'Nec tu', inquit 'filia, quicquam contristere, nec *prosapiae* tantae tuae *statuque* de matrimonio mortali metuas. Iam *faxo* nuptias non impares, sed legitimas et *iure civili congruas*'.

And then he said to Venus, facing her: 'And you, my daughter, do not be sad at all and have no fear for your great lineage and status on the ground of a marriage with a mortal. I will now make this marriage not unequal but legal and corresponding to civil law'.

Apuleius uses here one of his favorite words, *prosapia*, which was considered inappropriate for literary use by Quintilian, as a word too old and forgotten by readers (*Inst.* 1. 6. 40, see also Cic. *Tim.* 39). Moreover, we can see two archaic datives *statu* and *iure* in this part of Jupiter's speech, as well as an adjective *congruus*, before Apuleius attested only in Plautus. As for the form *faxo*, this archaism occurs three times in the story of Cupid and Psyche: twice in Venus' speeches (4. 30. 3; 5. 30. 2) and here, in Jupiter's address to her.

Jupiter's speech is the resolution of the story; it is noteworthy that the last lines concerning Venus' anger come from his mouth, not hers. Thanks to the archaic coloring these two sentences stand out in comparison to the rest of Jupiter's speech. As mentioned previously, Venus' soliloquy at the beginning of the story of Cupid and Psyche also takes a prominent position. It sets the main conflict, and Venus' way of speaking is notable for the first archaisms in the story. These things considered, it is tempting to conclude that the readers of the novel must have singled out Venus' voice from other characters'.²⁶

²⁴ Kenney 1990, 121; Zimmermann *et al.* 2004, 57–58; Zimmermann 2006, 329–332; Elford 2011, 99–100.

²⁵ Venus' language demonstrates that she possesses "old-fashioned morality": Kenney 1990, 121; Elford 2011, 128.

²⁶ J. Elford points out that Venus' most frequent action in the narrative is talking: Elford 2011, 133–136.

The elements of parody have long been noticed in Apuleius' novel, from the genre traits²⁷ to particular words.²⁸ In the story of Cupid and Psyche, Venus is an outstanding character in terms of parody: from the very beginning, she paints herself as a mighty goddess, *orbis totius alma Venus*, when in reality she experiences human emotions, is unable to control even her son's actions and often needs help from others. She is the goddess of love, but she opposes Cupid's relationship with Psyche and is mostly concerned with her own authority. As J. Elford puts it, she is "a sort of anti-Venus".²⁹ In this context, her archaic speech with legal terms is a perfect foil for her petty behavior. Relying on elevated vocabulary,³⁰ Venus tries to keep up a façade of a respected goddess, so even Jupiter himself needs to address her accordingly. In part, Venus' outstanding voice can be explained by tradition (in Virgil gods also archaize):³¹ gods speak no ordinary human language; they should likely speak in a more archaic way since they have been around much longer than humans. Still, no other god in the *Metamorphoses* invites attention through their speech in that manner. Furthermore, no other god in the novel is so concerned with their age. Although Venus is immortal, she is quite emotional about becoming a grandmother. Venus is jealous of Psyche partially because of her rival's youth, which is counterintuitive, as Venus does not age and is capable of bearing a child (*Met.* 5. 29. 4–5). Venus herself is not old, but her words for sure are.³²

There is no speech characterization in the *Metamorphoses per se*. Even though the peculiarities of Venus' voice are notable, they are not consistent, let alone unique. Still, the readers of the novel must have noted Venus' penchant for archaisms – a detail, which completes this vivid character and makes her carps even pettier.

Svetlana Dubova

*Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
St Petersburg*

dubovasetlanas@gmail.com

²⁷ For example, on Apuleius' relation to epic see Finkelpearl 1998, 36–55; Harrison 2013, 265–270, also Westerbrink 1978, 63–73.

²⁸ Callebat 1965, 352–357 gives numerous examples of instances, where archaic vocabulary provides an element of parody.

²⁹ Elford 2011, 146–147.

³⁰ Note the epic formula *sic effata* in 4. 31. 4 and 5. 31. 1, used specifically about angry Venus.

³¹ Palmer 1954, 112–113.

³² As E. Karakasis observes, elderly characters in Terence's plays tend to use more archaisms: Karakasis 2005, 60–61, 99, 119.

Bibliography

- F. F. Abbot, "The Use of Language as a Means of Characterization in Petronius", *CPh* 2: 1 (1907) 43–50.
- J. N. Adams, *Social Variation and the Latin Language* (Cambridge 2013).
- B. Boyce, *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 117 (Leiden 1991).
- L. Brant, *Apuleian Women and Genre* (Indiana 2016).
- L. Callebat, "L'Archaïsme dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée", *REL* 42 (1964) 346–361.
- L. Callebat, *Sermo Cotidianus dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée* (Caen 1968).
- J. C. K. Elford, *Characterization in Apuleius' Cupid and Psyche Episode* (Hamilton, Ontario 2011).
- E. Finkelpearl, *Metamorphosis of Language in Apuleius: A Study of Allusion in the Novel* (Ann Arbor 1998).
- E. Finkelpearl, "Psyche, Aeneas, and an Ass, Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 6.10–6.21", *TAPhA* 120 (1990) 333–347.
- S. Frangoulidis, *Epic Imitation in the "Metamorphoses" of Apuleius* (Ohio 1990).
- P. George, "Style and Character in the *Satyricon*", *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 5: 3 (1966) 336–358.
- S. J. Harrison, *Framing the Ass: Literary Texture in Apuleius' Metamorphoses* (Oxford 2013).
- J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (München 1972).
- E. Karakasis, *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*, Cambridge Classical Studies (Cambridge 2005).
- K. Kashima, "The Aeneid and Archaism", *Persephone: The Harvard Undergraduate Classics Journal* 2 (2017) 5–18.
- E. J. Kenney (ed.), *Cupid & Psyche* (Cambridge – New York – Port Chester – Melbourne – Sydney 1990).
- D. Mankin (ed.), *Cicero, De oratore Book III* (Cambridge 2011).
- J. Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine* (Paris 2^e 1946).
- R. May, *Apuleius and Drama: The Ass on Stage* (Oxford 2006).
- L. Nicolini, *Ad l(usum) lectoris: etimologia e giochi di parole in Apuleio* (Bologna 2011).
- L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London 1954).
- S. Parker, *Techniques of Description in Apuleius' Cupid and Psyche* (Hamilton, Ontario 1999).
- G. Schmeling, *A Commentary on the Satyricon of Petronius* (Oxford 2011).
- J. Tatum, *Apuleius and the Golden Ass* (Ithaca–London 1979).
- D. van Mal-Maeder, "And There Were Words: The Characterisation of the Gods in the *Metamorphoses*", in: S. Harrison (ed.), *Characterisation in Apuleius' Metamorphoses: Nine Studies* (Newcastle upon Tyne 2015) 147–165.
- D. van Mal-Maeder, M. Zimmerman, "The Many Voices in *Cupid and Psyche*", in: M. Zimmerman, V. Hunink, Th. D. McCreight, D. van Mal-Maeder,

- S. Panayotakis, V. Schmidt, B. Wesseling (eds.), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass II. Cupid and Psyche* (Groningen 1998) 83–102.
- M. von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style: A Synopsis* (Leiden–Boston 2003).
- A. G. Westerbrink, “Some Parodies in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*”, in: B. L. Hijmans Jr., R. Th. van der Paardt (eds.), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen 1978) 63–73.
- M. Zimmerman, “Awe and Opposition: The Ambivalent Presence of Lucretius in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*”, in: S. S. Byrne, E. P. Cueva, J. Alvares (eds.), *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel. Essays in Honor of Gareth L. Schmeling*, *Ancient Suppl.* 5 (Groningen 2006) 317–339.
- M. Zimmerman, S. Panayotakis, V. C. Hunink, W. H. Keulen, S. J. Harrison, Th. D. McCreight, B. Wesseling, D. van Mal-Maeder, *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses. Books IV 28–35, V and VI 1–24. The Tale of Cupid and Psyche* (Groningen 2004).

The article explores the character of Venus in Apuleius' story of Cupid and Psyche, as well as the lexical tools used for describing her actions and conveying her speech. Venus is one of the main characters; her speeches take prominent positions in the story and require special attention. Although the phenomenon of speech characterization in Latin literature is occasional, it may be assumed that the character of Venus is distinguished by archaic vocabulary. We see a variety of words with archaic tint either used by Venus or in relation to her, but the effect of surprise and novelty produced by these words is much more significant than their number. This effect is notable in Venus' soliloquy at the beginning of the story (*Met.* 4. 30) and Jupiter's address to her at the end of it (*Met.* 6. 23). Even though Apuleius' characters do not have consistent voice characteristics and the archaic words are mostly spread out randomly throughout the novel, it appears that archaic vocabulary is important for the figure of Venus. The elevated language with archaic and legal touches stands in contrast to her emotional and petty behavior, improper for a powerful goddess, which enhances the effect of parody.

Статья посвящена образу Венеры в сказке об Амуре и Психее Апулея, а также лексическим средствам, с помощью которых описываются ее действия и речь. Венера – один из главных героев сказки, и ее речи заслуживают особого внимания, так как занимают важное положение в структуре повествования. Несмотря на то, что в латинской литературе явление речевой характеристики персонажей встречается редко, можно утверждать, что образ Венеры выделяется склонностью к архаической лексике. Речь самой Венеры, ее описания, а также речи персонажей, обращающихся к ней, обнаруживают множество слов с архаической окраской, однако в данном случае важно не их количество, а эффект неожиданности и новизны, который они обеспечивают. Этот эффект особенно заметен в связи с монологом Венеры

в начале истории (*Met.* 4. 30) и речью Юпитера в ее конце (*Met.* 6. 23). Хотя Апулей не наделяет своих персонажей выраженными речевыми характеристиками и пользуется архаическими словами в основном беспорядочно, для образа Венеры, по-видимому, архаическая лексика имеет большое значение. Употребление Венерой возвышенных слов с архаическим оттенком и юридических терминов резко контрастирует с ее импульсивным и мелочным поведением, недостойным могущественной богини, за счет чего обеспечивается эффект пародии.

Hanan M. I. Ismail

SOME INSIGHTS INTO EGYPT'S HISTORY
UNDER THE REIGN OF MAXIMINUS THRAX
(MID-MARCH / 25 MARCH
AD 235 – 10 MAY AD 238)

The reign of Maximinus Thrax has been discussed extensively in scholarly literature. However, Egypt has been noticeably overlooked. Furthermore, the main classical sources rarely offer historical information about Egypt. For instance, Herodian of Antioch (AD 170–240) scarcely mentions Egypt. His account gives us a general notion of the heavy taxation on the whole Roman Empire and portrays the widespread bloodshed among the remnants of Alexander Severus' supporters (Herod. *Hist. Rom.* 6–7); he mentions Egypt casually when describing the city of Carthage during the revolt against Maximinus (*Hist. Rom.* 7. 6. 1–2, tr. Whittaker 1970):

[Γορδιανός] ἀπάρας [τε] τῆς Θύστρου ἐς τὴν Καρχηδόνα ἠπειχθη, ἦν ἦδει μεγίστην τε οὖσαν καὶ πολυάνθρωπον, ἵν' ὥσπερ ἐν Ῥώμῃ πάντα πράττοι· ἡ γὰρ πόλις ἐκείνη καὶ δυνάμει χρημάτων καὶ πλήθει τῶν κατοικούντων καὶ μεγέθει μόνῃς Ῥώμῃς ἀπολείπεται, φιλονεικοῦσα πρὸς τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ Ἀλεξάνδρου πόλιν περὶ δευτερείων).

Then he (Gordian) left Thysdrus and marched to Carthage, the largest and most heavily populated city (as Gordian knew), so that he could act exactly as if he were in Rome. The city is the next after Rome in wealth, population, and size, though there is rivalry for second place between it and Alexandria in Egypt.

Eusebius of Caesarea (AD 260/265–339/340) concentrates on the persecution of Christians during the reigns of the Roman emperors. So this article surveys the available papyri and ostraca that cover the three-year period, through which some new insights into its political, economic, administrative, and social history can be attained.

The reign of Emperor Maximinus Thrax was short,¹ so there are few documents one can rely on to trace changes that occurred in Egypt under

¹ Rathbone 1986, 109; Sijpesteijn 1984, 74–75; Sickle 1929, 289.

his rule. According to Herodian of Antioch, Maximinus was a lowborn barbarian, and he behaved as such. His popularity was confined to the soldiers. In many instances, he offended and disrespected the Senate. Under his rule, the people were burdened by unprecedented rates of taxes.² Maximinus Thrax was considered one of the Persecuting Emperors, and his persecution (διωγμός) was generally given sixth place in the canon.³

Given the scarcity of evidence for the history of Egypt under the reign of Maximinus Thrax, it is essential to survey the papyri and ostraca of the same period. They not only supply information about Egypt in this time, but also link it to the general history of the Roman Empire. Forty-three documents date back to the reign of Maximinus Thrax, only twenty-eight of them citing the name of Emperor Maximinus.⁴ The following division of the documents is suggested here:

Official Orders: *SB* I. 421 (1 March AD 236, Memphis: instructions for a solemn procession in honor of Maximus' accession to the throne);

² Herod. *Hist. Rom.* 6. 7. 8 – 8. 2; 7. 3. 3–6; 4. 1–3; Mullens 1948, 65–66.

³ Grumel 1956, 59–66.

⁴ *BGU* III. 735. 1: (ἔτους) α Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου; *BGU* IV. 1062. 26: (ἔτους) γ Ἀυτοκράτ[ορο]ς Καίσαρος Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου[υ] [Μαξιμείνου] Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβ[αστοῦ καὶ Γαίου]; *C. Pap.* 2. 1. 78 l. 13: [Μαξί]μεινου [Εὐ]σε[βοῦς Εὐτυχ]οῦς; *O. Berl.* 48. 2: Μαξιμείνου καὶ Μαξίμου; *O. Stras.* I. 406. 3: Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ; *O. Wilcken* 996. 2: [τῶν κυρίων] ἡμῶν Μαξιμείνου; *O. Wilcken* 997. 2: [ἡμῶν Γαίου Ἰουλ(ίου)] Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου; *P. Euphrates* 15. 3: Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβ(οῦς) Εὐτυχ(οῦς) Ἀνεκίητου Σεβ(αστοῦ); *P. Lond.* II. 212 B. 2: [Οὐή]ρου Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Ε[ὐτυχοῦς]; *P. Lond.* III. 948 r. 15: (ἔτους) γ Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ; *P. Oxy.* VI. 912. 39: Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς; *P. Oxy.* VIII. 1114. 17: ἔτους τρίτου Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς; *P. Oxy.* XLIII. 3132. 8: Ἰουλίον Οὐήρον Μαξιμείνου; *ibid.* 24: Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου; *P. Oxy.* L. 3564. 10: Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς; *P. Rein.* II. 91. 9: [Οὐήρο]υ Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ; *P. RyI.* II. 109. 14: Οὐήρου Μ[α]ξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχο[ῦ]ς Σεβαστοῦ; *PSI* IX. 1067. 18: [Οὐή]ρου Μαξιμείνου Γερμανικοῦ μεγί[σ]του; *PSI* X. 1121. 8: Ἰουλίον Οὐήρον Μαξιμείνου καὶ Μαξί[μ]ου; *PSI* XII. 1248. 38: Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου; *PSI* XII. 1254. 11: Μαξιμείνου εὐσεβοῦς εὐτυχοῦς σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ μεγίστου; *P. Wisc.* I. 15. 14: Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Γαίου; *SB* I. 5806. 24: Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου; *SB* XVI. 12753. 3: [(ἔτους)][.][Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ; *Stud. Pal.* XX. 37. 13: Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβ[αστοῦ]; *Stud. Pal.* XX. 45. 14: ἔ[τους τετ]άρτου Ἀυτοκράτορ[ος Καίσαρ]ος Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐ[ήρο]υ Μαξιμείνου Ε[ὐσεβο]ῦς; *Stud. Pal.* XX. 47. 1: [ἔτους τετ]άρτου Ἀ[υ]τοκρ[άτορ]ος Καίσαρος Γα[ί]ου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξιμείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς.

O. Did. 29 (Jan.–Jun. AD 236, the Eastern Desert: an official letter to the curators on the proclamation of Maximus with his father, Emperor Maximinus); *P. Rein.* II. 91 (16 May AD 236, Apollonopolites Heptacomia: letter from the prefect Maevius Honoratianus to the strategos of Apollonopolites Heptacomia); *PSI* I. 35 (25 March AD 237, Oxy.: orders of payments); *P. Oxy.* XLIII. 3118 (AD 237, Oxy.: official letter from the prefect Cornelius Galba to the procurator Phari).

Public Tax Registers and Reports: *BGU* III. 735 (4 Jun. – 29 Aug. AD 235, Arsin.: a tax register); *BGU* III. 734 (AD 235 or later, Arsin.: a tax register); *BGU* IV. 1062 (29 Aug. AD 236, Oxy.: tax collection); *PSI* VII. 733 (3 May AD 235, Oxy.: reports of πράκτορες to the strategos); *P. Oxy.* LXXII. 4892 (17 July AD 236, Oxy.: report of village scribe).

Official Receipts: *SB* I. 5806 (2 Sep. AD 235, Oxy.: lease receipt); *P. Oxy.* L. 3564 (5 Oct. AD 235, Oxy.: receipt for a grain transfer); *P. Lond.* III. 947 v a = *HGV* 22740 (19 May AD 236: a payment in money); *O. Stras.* I. 406 (10 July AD 236, Theb.: a payment in grain); *P. Lond.* III. 948 r. (19 Oct. AD 236, Theadelphia, Arsin.: a contract for grain transport); *P. Ross. Georg.* V. 19 (16 March AD 237, Memphis: receipt of sacrificial animals for Apis cult); *O. Amst.* 68 (15 July AD 237, Theb.: a granary receipt); *O. Berl.* 48 (5 Dec. AD 237, Upper Egypt: a payment in money).

Notices, Declarations, Oaths, and Applications: *PSI* IX. 1067 (10 Dec. AD 236, Pois Hermopolites: request for registering new birth ἀπαρχή of a little girl); *SB* I. 5137 = *C. Pap. gr.* 2. 1. 77 (9 Feb. AD 237, Lykopolites: a death notice); *PSI* XII. 1254 (28 Sept. – 27 Oct. AD 237, Oxy.: application for ἀνάκρισις of a slave); *P. Oxy.* XLIII. 3132 (2 Nov. AD 237, Oxy.: oath on undertaking service).

Requests, Petitions, and Complaints: *P. Harr.* II. 200 (9 May AD 236, Philadelphia, Arsin.: petition); *ChLA.* V. 290 = *P. Mich.* III. 165 (AD 236, Oxy: request to appoint a guardian); *SB* XIV. 11863 (before 2 July AD 237, Karanis, Arsin.: a complaint against the use of a liturgy); *CPR* VII. 11 (9 Feb. – 29 Aug. AD 237: a complaint for payment of interest).

Private Contracts and Letters: *P. Oxy.* VI. 912 (30 Aug. AD 235, Oxy.: lease of a cellar); *PSI* XII. 1248 (after 14 Dec. AD 235, Oxy.: private letter from Menesthianos to Apollonianos and Spartiates about five men escaping from Oxyrhynchus); *P. Wisc.* I. 15 (24 Jun. AD 236, Bubastis, Oxyrhynchus: exchange of donkeys); *P. Grenf.* II. 67 (6 Aug. AD 237, Bacchias, Arsin.: a contract on hiring two dancers); *P. Bodl.* I. 43 (13 Sept. AD 237, Magna Oasis: a loan of money); *Stud. Pal.* XX. 45 (28 Sept. – 27 Oct. AD 237, Mochyris, Marmarique: a loan of money).

Wills and Testaments: *Stud. Pal.* XX. 35 (5 Apr. AD 235, Herakliopolites: testament); *P. Ryl.* II. 109 (23 Aug. AD 235, Hermopolis: a valuation of an inheritance); *P. Oxy.* VIII. 1114 (AD 237: a declaration of inheritance).

Army Documents Concerning Egypt: *O. Did.* 286 (c. AD 235, the Egyptian Eastern Desert: a list of Palmyrian names).

Army and Public Documents Concerning Egypt's Eastern Neighborhood: *P. Dura* 125 (20 Apr. AD 235, Dura-Europus: decision of a tribune); *P. Dura* 126 (20 Apr. AD 235, Dura-Europus: decision of a tribune on division of property); *P. Euphr.* 15 (12 Dec. AD 235, Beth Phuraia, Syria Coele: incomplete act); *ChLA* IX. 382 = *P. Dura* 127 (c. AD 235, Syria: decision of a tribune); *P. Dura* 116 (AD 236, Syria: names and notations by Centuries and Turmae); *P. Dura* 117 (AD 236, Dura-Europus: list of names by Centuries, with numerals).

Unknown Content: *P. Lond.* II. 2128 (26 May – 24 Jun. AD 237: beginning of an incomplete official letter).

There are seven documents among the forty-three listed above that could provide some historical details of the period. They extend through the reign of Maximinus Thrax.

A letter from the prefect Maevius Honoratianus to the strategos of Apollonopolites Heptacomia dating back to the second year of the reign of Maximinus Thrax reveals disorders in the nome.⁵ The prefect tells the strategos that he was aware through his office of the hostile manifestations⁶ and instructs him not to repress these disturbances with violence.⁷ It seems obvious that he sought to quench it peacefully and desired to solve the causes of these disorders.⁸

It is known that the metropolis of the new nome Ἀπολλωνοπολίτης Ἑπτακωμίας was Heptakomia, where the well-known Apollonios resided during the reign of Hadrian. It was a small township with a chiefly Egyptian population and a minority of Greeks.⁹ Wilcken identified it as bordering the Antaiopolite and Hypselite districts. Furthermore, the district replaced the former Aphroditopolite nome.¹⁰ Tacoma estimated

⁵ *P. Rein.* II. 91 (16 May AD 236, Apollonopolis Heptacomia).

⁶ Il. 1–4: [Μ]ήσιος Ὀνωρ[ατιανός] . . φ στρατηγῷ Ἀπολλωνοπολείτου κάτω . [. . .]ε . () κωμῶν χაίρειν. [ἐ]δη[λῶ]θη μοι ἐκ τῆς τάξεως [τ]οὺς αὐτόθι ἐκβεβη[κέ]ναι περὶ τοῦ α. . . . [. . .].

⁷ Il. 5–6: τοιγαροῦν φρόντ[ι]σον μηδεμίαν μέ[μψιν . . .] ἐν τούτου ἐπ[α]κολο[υ]θῆσαι

⁸ Il. 6–7: ἴν[α - ca.9 -]ια παρ' ἐμοὶ . . η. ε καταστ[- ca.10 -]θαι βούλομαι.

⁹ Wilcken 1908, 163–164.

¹⁰ Fuks 1984, 133.

the population of Apollonoplites Heptacomia at approximately 9000. He gives the following account of the population of some nomes:¹¹ “Going from North to South, the population of Thmouis in the Eastern Delta comprised 25 000 inhabitants at a minimum, ...that of Oxyrhynchus, between 20 000 and 42 000 inhabitants... and that of Apollonopolis Heptakomias, 9000 inhabitants”. Even though Tacoma was very cautious about his general estimates,¹² he considered the estimate of the population of Apollonopolis Heptakomias to be more reliable.¹³

For taxes and taxation policy, we cannot exclude from our analysis the *P. Oslo*. III. 111 (15 Feb. AD 235, Oxy.), which sheds light on the cause of these manifestations, although it dates back to a month before the accession of Emperor Maximinus. *P. Oslo*. III. 111 is a list of free men and freedmen, arranged according to houses; it is part of a series of records of all free men and freedmen who on a fixed date lived in the Hermaion and the Goosekeepers’ quarters of Oxyrhynchus (women, children, elder persons, and slaves not having been registered).¹⁴ The lists were directed to the Prytanis’ office. So, it may display the impact of the Antoninian constitution on the artisans and record information about the professions that is usually used in taxation. *BGU* III. 735 (June – 29 Aug. AD 235, Arsinoite), the earliest document from Maximinus’ reign, is also a fragment of a register of tax payments for houses and lands with relevant confirmations. It has been suggested that it reflects the actual application of the Antoninian Constitution and the later taxation from the time of Severus Alexander (AD 222–235).¹⁵

The main cause of Apollonopolites Heptacomia’s disorder may have been the imposition of such new taxes, which, along with the firm grip by the police,¹⁶ ignited the political upheavals on a nome with its predominantly Egyptian population. The economic motivation for this

¹¹ Tacoma 2006, 44, cf. 66: “The resulting urban system can be described as follows. Seen for the whole of Egypt, it consists of one very large center, a couple of quite sizeable towns, some towns of intermediate size and a majority of rather small ones. Expressed in orders of magnitude, ...Hermopolis was about five times as large as Apollonopolis Heptakomias, while Alexandria was ten times as large as Hermopolis”.

¹² Tacoma 2006, 46.

¹³ Tacoma 2006, 52, cf. 50: “We need to know whether there existed more towns as small as Apollonopolis Heptakomias”.

¹⁴ For more details about taxes on crafts and professions in the third century, cf. Venticinque 2016, 18.

¹⁵ In the year AD 235, a census of houses in one of the wards of the city enumerates 42 sparsely occupied ones and 31 empty or sealed ones (*P. Oslo*. 111; *BGU* 734). Cf. Johnson 1950, 152–154.

¹⁶ Homoth-Kuhs 2005, 43; 50; 55–60.

hostile manifestation thus may be supposed to be an aspect of the economic repercussions of the *Third Century Crisis*.

The second papyrus discussed here is from Oxyrhynchus. It is a letter from a high official, probably the prefect of AD 237, Cornelius Galba,¹⁷ to the procurator Phari (ἐπίτροπος Φάρου) asking him to consider a request by two women to prevent the departure of a certain man. According to this evidence, granting permissions for or restrictions on departure by sea from Alexandria were among procurator Phari's responsibilities:

Cornelius Galba to Chrestio, procurator Phari, greetings. I have given orders that the letters written to me by Claudia Philoromaea, through Claudia Isidora her daughter and Claudia Erotilla alias Apolinaria, are to be subjoined. You are to take cognizance of them and take measures to prevent the departure of the man they mention, Septimius Ammonius, and to give instructions to the other persons who keep watch over such matters concerning...

There are three papyrus attestations to the procurator Phari, dating from the end of the second century and up to the first half of the third century.¹⁸ This official was in charge of the main Egyptian harbor and its commercial traffic. The papyri, however, offer insufficient information about his duties. Only two texts emerged: a private petition sent to the prefect about issuing and one restricting permissions to leave Egypt through the harbor. The first document dates back to Maximinus Thrax and the other one to Philip the Arab (Feb. AD 244–Sep. AD 249).¹⁹ The two documents illustrate an aspect of government vigilance on the

¹⁷ *P. Oxy.* XLIII. 3118 (c. AD 237–238, Oxy.).

¹⁸ Procurator Phari Alexandriae ad Hegyptum (*CIL* VI. 8582 = *ILS* 1576 (late 2nd cent. AD); ἐπίτροπος Φάρου *P. Oxy.* XLIII. 3118 (AD 237); ἐπίτροπος τῆς Φάρου *P. Oxy.* X, 271 (AD 247).

¹⁹ *P. Oxy.* X. 1271 (AD 246) is an application to the prefect Valerius Firmus from a woman who was a citizen of Side for a permit to leave the country via Pharos. An extremely cursive official endorsement in Latin remains partly undeciphered, but is not likely to have contained more than a formal authorization: "To Valerius Firmus, prefect of Egypt, from Aurelia Maeciana of Side. I wish, my lord, to sail out by way of Pharos; I therefore beg you to write to the procurator of Pharos to allow me to leave, as is usual. Pachon 1. Farewell". The Latin endorsement, *P. Oxy.* XVII. 2132 (c. AD 250), shows also some restrictions in the last two decades of the first half of the 3rd cent. AD. A man wrote to the prefect, wanting to go to a festival of Antinoos and seeking a similar permission from the prefect's office in Greek. Yet, the festival was most likely the Megala Antinoeia at Antinoopolis, and the text may thus not deal with going outside the province, but rather with the determination of residence or a notification of movements.

Egyptian borders during the first half of the 3rd century AD, and the strictness with which ingress and egress were controlled.²⁰ The general legislative framework for this procedure can be found in the γνώμων 66–67,²¹ where a major concern of the passage is the illegal export of slaves. Thus, one specific concern of the Pharos administration may have been the control of outgoing slaves as well as other passengers (e.g. their owners).²² Puk, therefore, concluded that the diligent control of departures from Egypt was due to taxation issues and fiscal interests, making sure that no one left with financial debts to the tax authorities.²³

It can be argued that the main reasons to prevent departure in *P. Oxy.* XLIII. 3118 (AD 237) were financial rather than religious. The blacklisted man, Septimius Ammonius, may have been the same person who some years later was strategos of Themistos and Polemon district of the Arsinoites.²⁴ Taking into consideration that the two persons who submitted the application were women (although it is unlikely that one of them, Claudia Isidora, is the landowner Claudia Isidora),²⁵ tax collection was the prefect's main concern during the economic crisis. These observations point to fiscal, rather than religious, reasons for restricting travel, because it was never mentioned that preventing travel was one of the means of persecuting Christians.²⁶ Furthermore, Eusebius does not attribute a widespread persecution in Egypt to Maximinus, who in AD 235 forced on the Christians a limited and carefully selective persecution by issuing his decree on the removal of only the "leaders" of the churches.²⁷

The third papyrus implies a shortage of manpower and thus also reflects one aspect of the *Third Century Crisis*. It is a contract for a donkey exchange.²⁸ Using Litinas' references to sales of donkeys as a guide, a few data on donkeys' prices show the successive and rapid increase of the donkeys' and she-asses' prices during the third

²⁰ Puk 2010, 227.

²¹ *BGU* V. 1210 = γνώμων of ἴδιος λόγος (after AD 149, Theadelphia), cf. Puk 2010, 227.

²² For more details, see Straus 2004, 302–305.

²³ Purpura 2002, 140–141.

²⁴ *BGU* I. 7 (AD 247): decree of Septimius Ammonius alias Dionysius, strategos of Themistos and Polemon district of the Arsinoites.

²⁵ Thomas 2004, 150; *P. Oxy.* XLIII. 3118 nn. 5–10.

²⁶ Barnes 1968, 43.

²⁷ Keresztes 1969, 617–618.

²⁸ *P. Wisc.* I. 15 (24 June AD 236, Bubastis or Oxyrhynchus).

century.²⁹ Our papyrus is the only contract regulating the exchange of a she-ass for another, pregnant one:³⁰ Potamon from Bubastis and Sarapion from Oxyrhynchus exchanged their she-asses, while Sarapion had to pay an additional sum of eighty drachmas.

Aurelius Potamon, son of Pecherous, his mother being Taopis from the town of Bubastis, greets Aurelius Sarapion, son of Heron, his mother being Tachairinon from the town of Oxyrhynchus. I declare that I have exchanged with you my mouse-colored she-ass, which is still a foal, and have also received from you, at the same time, a white, adult, pregnant she-ass, with a mark on the right eye, and I have received from you eighty silver drachmas, the amount that my she-ass was estimated to be worth more. This is written in two copies, and we have asked each other the question, and we have both consented. In the second year of the reign of Emperor Caesar Gaius Julius Verus Maximinus Pius Felix Augustus and Gaius Julius Verus Maximus, the most holy Caesar Augustus, son of Augustus, 30 Payni.³¹

Why was the price of the mouse-colored she-ass that was still a foal greater than the white, adult, pregnant she-ass that bore a mark on its right eye? It would be expected that the foal (πῶλον) would be lower in price than the adult one (τέλειαν),³² which would give birth to one or more

²⁹ Litinas 1999, 199–204: *SB XVI*. 12612 (AD 202–203) homologia, 1 fem. (5 years) = 800 dr.; *P. Oxy.* XIV. 1707 descr. = *SP I*. 33 (AD 204, Oxyrhynchus), cheirographon, 1 fem. (1 year) = 600 dr.; *PSI I*. 79 (AD 216–217, Oxyrhynchus), cheirographon, 2 fem. (4 years) = 1,500 dr.; *SPP XXII*. 16 (AD 217), cheirographon, 1 fem. = 400 dr.; *BGU II*. 413 = *M. Chr.* 263 (AD 219, Kerkesoucha), notarial protocol, 1 male (5 years) = 500 dr.; *P. Diog.* 28 (AD 223, Philadelpheia), cheirographon, 1 fem. = 600 dr.; *P. Wisc.* I. 15 (AD 236, Boubastis or Oxyrhynchus), exchange of donkeys (cheirographon), 1 fem. for 1 pregnant (5 years + 80 dr.); *SB VI*. 9221 = *P. Cair. Isid.* 84 (AD 267 or 276, Karanis), homologia, 1 male = 500 dr.; *PSI XIV*. 1417 (AD 290–291, Oxyrhynchus), cheirographon, 1 fem. (5 years) = 1 tal.; *P. Oslo*. III. 134 (2nd half of the 3rd cent. AD), cheirographon, 1 male = 132 dr.; *SB VIII*. 9829 (3rd cent. AD, Oxyrhynchus), cheirographon, 2 male (5 years) = 4 tal.; *P. Mert.* III. 106 (c. AD 280, Oxyrhynchus), cheirographon, 1 fem. (5 years) = 4000 dr.

³⁰ *P. Wisc.* I. 15 (24 June AD 236, Bubastis or Oxyrhynchus).

³¹ Ll. 5–11: ὁμολογῶ ἀντικατηλλάξα(ι) σοι ὄνον θήλιαν μυόχρωμον πῶλον καὶ ἐσχηκέναι ἀπὸ σου τὴν ἴσην ὄνον λευκὴν τέλειαν ἐγκυον (ἔγγυον Παρ.) σημεῖον παραπεποδισμένην ὀφθαλμῷ δεξιῷ καὶ ἔσχον παρὰ σου τοῦ Σαραπίωνος τὰς ¹⁰ ἑσταμένας πλείως ἐπιτειμήσεως ἄργυρίου δραχμὰς ὀγδοήκοντα.

³² Two examples show that a full-grown female donkey was higher in price than a female foal. Every pair of these documents came from adjacent nomes and from years close to each other. In *SB XVI*. 12612 (AD 202–203, Soknopaiu Nesus), the price of a full-grown female donkey (τέλειαν) was 80 dr., and in *P. Oxy.* XIV. 1707

foals. The higher price for the foal in this document can be explained by its readiness to work due to its youth and status or by its capacity to work perfectly (its age is not mentioned in the contract). The stamina of the pregnant she-ass would be at its lowest, because the female donkey's gestation period is 11–12 months, not to mention its mark. So, the two contracting parties reckoned the readiness and power of their exchanged she-asses. We also should consider that the estimated difference was 80 drachmas, which is the health and power variance between them.

This assumption matches the view of Hughes, who attributes the increase of 150 percents in donkey prices to the Antonine plague (AD 165–180). This plague reduced the labor force of the farmers, many of whom were infected and died.³³ Furthermore, Dionysios, Bishop of Alexandria, left a rhetorical comment about a serious drop in the Alexandrian population due to plague in the third century.³⁴ Anachoresis is also attested during the reign of Maximinus in a report, *PSI* XII. 1248 (before 14 Dec. AD 235), that five men fled from Oxyrhynchus.

Scarce documentary evidence provides some new insights into the administrative changes occurring in Egypt under the reign of Maximinus Thrax. The earliest testimony is an ostrakon from the Eastern Desert.³⁵ It is an official letter sent to the curators of the Roman forts in the Eastern Desert, on Emperor Maximinus' proclamation of his son Maximus' caesarship.³⁶ The ostrakon is possibly the earliest evidence of the official

(AD 204, Oxyrhynchus), the price of a female donkey aged one year (πρωτοβώλος [l. πρωτοβόλον]) was 60 dr. In *PSI* I. 79 (AD 216–217, Oxyrhynchus), two female donkeys, aged four years (τὰς δύο τετραβόλους), were sold for 1500 dr., i.e., 750 dr. each. In *SPP* XXII. 16 (AD 217, Soknopaiou Nesos), the price of one female donkey (age unmentioned) was 400 dr., which means that the price of a four-year-old female donkey was higher. Furthermore, I went to the main three donkey markets in Giza governorate, which are held weekly in Barageel, Muneeb, and Mazghuna villages. I asked the donkey merchants about the prices of female donkeys at different ages, and they explained that a female donkey is sold for a higher price because it gives birth, which brings a financial return.

³³ Hughes 1994, 18, 163; Scheidel also admits that prices in Egypt “never returned to pre-plague levels” (he considers the years 190–260 to be post-plague); an increase in prices denotes an increase in demand, cf. Scheidel 2002, 291; Scheidel-Southerland 2009, 13.

³⁴ Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 7. 21. 9: εἶτα θαυμάζουσιν καὶ διαποροῦσιν, πόθεν οἱ συνεχεῖς λοιμοί, πόθεν αἱ χαλεπαὶ νόσοι, πόθεν αἱ παντοδαπαὶ φθοραὶ, πόθεν ὁ ποικίλος καὶ πολὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὄλεθρος.

³⁵ *O. Did.* 29 (Jan.–Jun. AD 236, the Eastern Desert).

³⁶ There is another, earlier document that attests Maximus' accession, *SB* I. 421 (1 March AD 236, Memphis: instruction for a solemn procession in honor of Maximus' accession to the throne).

called “opin(i)ator” (ὀπιν(ι)άτωρ).³⁷ Helene Cuvigny tentatively proposes to read in the first line the word ὀρτινάτω, which at first glance can be understood as ὀρδινάτω rather than οπινατωρ,³⁸ viz. the title of the sender was δεκάταρχος ὀπινάτωρ.³⁹ Cuvigny points out that *ordinarii* were normally centurions,⁴⁰ not *decuriones*. The office of the *opinator* could, on the contrary, be held by a military man of any rank (including a *decurion*). Mitthof recently studied this office and concluded that the function of the *opinatores* was to receive contributions in money owed to their military unit and to assure the transport of this money to the camp.⁴¹

The task of the *opinator* in Didymoi ostrakon matches the later attestations on papyri of the *opinators*' functions. The earliest one dates to AD 253–261.⁴² An ἑκατόνταρχος ὀπι[νιάτωρ] and several strategoi were addressed in a circular sent perhaps by the prefect of Egypt to hold a celebration in honor of Valerian (AD 253–260). The latest document dates back to AD 300;⁴³ the papyrus mentions *opinatores* who were centurions, *signiferi*, *imaginiferi*, cavaliers, and infantrymen. The

³⁷ *Opinio* is an assessment of the amount of corn that the owner of a provincial landed property had to deliver to the army. *Opinatores* were officials charged with the evaluation and collection of such contributions. Cf. Berger 1991, 609.

³⁸ *O. Did.* 29. 1–3 (http://papyri.info/ddbdp/o.did;29?rows=3&start=28&fl=id,title&fq=series_led_path:O.Did.;*;*:*&sort=series+asc,volume+asc,item+asc&p=29&t=466):

1, ms (perpendicular) [A]ὐρήλιος Σαραπάμμων δεκάταρχῳ ὀρτινάτω

2, ms (perpendicular) κουράτωρσιν τοῖς ἀπὸ Φοινι[κ]ῶν(ος)

3, ms (perpendicular) μέχρι [.] Βερ[ε]νίκης vac. ? χαίρειν.

“Aurelius Sarapammon... to the garrisons curators from Phoinikon to Berenice”.

³⁹ As Cuvigny notes, the infrared photo taken in 2009 does not encourage reading a beta instead of rho, and it suggests an epsilon (perhaps preceded by an erased letter) instead of an omicron. She admits that, from the point of view of palaeography, the proposed reading οπινατωρ is uncertain (it is also unclear whether these two words stand in the nominative case and point to the sender, or in the dative case and point to the recipients of the document), see Cuvigny 2012, 92–93.

⁴⁰ Rea 1980, 217.

⁴¹ Cuvigny 2012, 93; Mitthof 2001, 158–165.

⁴² *P. Oxy.* XLII. 3029 (AD 253–261):

[- ca.? - σ]τρατηγοῖς τῶν ὑπογεγρα(αμμένων) ν[ομοῶν - ca.? -]

[- ca.? -]. νων ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μεσορῆ μ[ηνὸς - ca.? -]

[- ca.? -]εντι ἑκατοντάρχῳ οπιν[- ca.? -]

5 [- ca.? - τ]ῆς εὐτυχεστάτης ἡμέρας [- ca.? -]

[- ca.? -] Οὐαλεριανοῦ τοῦ πρεσβυτέ[ρου - ca.? -]

[(hand 2) - ca.? - ἐρρωσθαι ὑμ]ᾶς εὔχομαι

[(hand 1) - ca.? -]ιτυ Κυνοπολίτου ἄνω

⁴³ *P. Panop. Beatty*, 2 (2 Feb. AD 300) ll. 41–42: δεκαδάρχῳ ὀπινιάτορι, 174: δεκαδάρχοι οπινιάτορες.

opinatores clearly appear as collectors, charged with receiving from the civil authorities the money destined for the pay and the donatives due their military unit. Therefore, it is obvious that the circumstances in which our ostrakon was written were precisely those in which the soldiers received donatives.⁴⁴

In the same context, André Piganiol notes that it is not entirely correct to translate *opinator* as “food commissioner”. The *opinator*’s responsibility was confined to estimating the army’s demands in cash, but receiving payment in kind.⁴⁵ Piganiol discussed the duty of an *opinator* in *P. Oxy.* XII. 1419 (AD 265),⁴⁶ which is a prytanis of the senate’s order to a tax collector to pay the prytanis 1800 drachmae required for military supplies credited by the tax collector to the *opinator*, the exactor of wheat equivalents. The prytanis added a line after the fifth line, l. 5a: (hand 2) ὀπεινάτορι ἀπαι(τητῆ) τι(μῆς) πυροῦ, so Piganiol concluded that the *opinator* was a soldier appointed to be responsible for determining the value of wheat collected under the annona.⁴⁷ Thomas endorsed Piganiol’s argument that *opinator* is not a proper name, but the title of a military tax officer.⁴⁸ Sijpesteijn assumed that the unnamed person was in charge of the duties of the *opinator* and the *apaitetes* together.⁴⁹

Interestingly, Cuvigny’s views on the Didymoi ostrakon as the earliest available evidence of the *opinator* in Egypt match well with the aforementioned debates. We can suppose that the creation of the *opinator* as a military official in Egypt in the AD 230s served to coordinate the demands of the military personnel in the Egyptian eastern desert. The creation of this office significantly coincided with the attention given to Egypt’s commercial revenue, which substituted for most of the agricultural revenues after the decline of the latter.⁵⁰ The Roman province Africa Proconsularis became the main supplier of wheat production. Therefore, it gained an influential role in the revolution of the Gordians

⁴⁴ Cuvigny 2012, 89–97.

⁴⁵ Piganiol 1946–1947, 13.

⁴⁶ *P. Oxy.* XII. 1419: “From the Prytanis to Thonius, collector of city dues, greeting. Pay me from the tax-farming contributions that you have exacted in the nome the 1500 drachmae that you credited through the public bank to *opinator*, exactor of wheat equivalents, and further on account of the annona of the legionaries sent from Heraclammonos with Ischyriion, corn collector, another 300 drachmae, making 1800 dr. in all. (Signed.) Pay the 1800 drachmae. The 12th year, Pauni 4”; Piganiol 1946, 137.

⁴⁷ Piganiol 1946–1947, 13: “Opinator, nom propre ou titre de fonction?... il désigne le militaire chargé d’estimer la valeur des blés perçus au titre de l’annone”.

⁴⁸ Thomas 1985, 115.

⁴⁹ Sijpesteijn 1991, 47–48.

⁵⁰ Cf. Nappo – Zerbini 2009, 61–78.

(19 March AD 238), which erupted against Maximinus Thrax and resulted in Gordian III's ascension to the throne (22–26 July AD 238).⁵¹

The ostrakon also adds a new explanation of how communications functioned between the prefect of Egypt and the garrisons in the Eastern Desert in the reign of Maximinus Thrax. It reveals an ambiguity surrounding a certain title that Rea was confused about in his commentary on an Oxyrhynchus document dating back to AD 214–246.⁵²

The editor believes that the sender of the aforementioned ostrakon, Aurelius Sarapammon, who belonged to the central administration, was the same person who, in *P. Oxy.* LI. 3615 (AD 212–248),⁵³ held the title that Rea described as the rare and mysterious one,⁵⁴ “overseer of prefectural letters and other matters” (Σαραπάμμων ἐπιτηρητῆς ἡγεμονικῶν ἐπιστολῶν καὶ ἄλλων).⁵⁵ It is unlikely that Aurelius Sarapammon was a nome strategos. He was the head of the military administration in the Berenice desert. Thus, it might be argued that the corresponding administrative changes and the introduction of this official rank did not take place before the reign of Maximinus Thrax in Egypt.⁵⁶

⁵¹ Rea 1972, 1–19; Townsend 1930, 62–66; Townsend 1928, 231–238.

⁵² *P. Oxy.* LI. 3615 (AD 214–246).

⁵³ LI. 1–8: Αὐρήλιος Κλαύδιος Λυκαρίων ὁ καὶ Σαραπάμμων ἐπιτηρητῆς ἡγεμονικῶν ἐπιστολῶν καὶ ἄλλων Αὐρηλίῳ Ἰέρακι τῷ καὶ Σαραπίωνι βασιλ(ικῶ) γρ(αμματεῖ) Ἑρμοπολ(ίτου) τῷ φιλάτῳ vac. χαίρειν. ἃ ἔπεμψ[α]ς ια βιβλία κααχ[ωρισ]θησό[μενα - ca.? -].

⁵⁴ Rea writes n. 2–3: “The rare title II. 2–3 [Σαραπάμμων ἐπιτηρητῆς ἡγεμονικῶν ἐπιστολῶν καὶ ἄλλων] leaves much obscure. In both instances [*P. Oxy.* XVII. 2116. 2 (AD 229); *PSI* XII. 1249. 14–16 (5 July AD 265)] the official is apparently concerned with the registration of records reaching Alexandria from the districts, rather than what we might expect from the title, the correspondences of the prefect. In *P. Strasb. inv.* 31+32 recto IV 18 (= *Archiv.* 4 [1908] 123) there is mention of records registered in Alexandria ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπιτηρητοῦ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, who seems very likely to have held the same office”.

⁵⁵ Translation: “Aurelius Claudius Lycarion alias Sarapammon, overseer of prefectural letters and other matters, to Aurelius Hierax alias Sarapion, royal scribe of the Hermopolite nome, his dearest colleague, greeting. The... records that you sent to be filed ...”.

⁵⁶ Cuvigny 2012, 104–105, a comment on *O. Did.* 40 (c. AD 219): “L’apparition de ce titre (ἐπίτροπος ὄρουσ – *H. I.*) sans parallèle coïncide avec la double disparition dans nos sources du *praefectus Montis Berenicidis* et de l’épistratège de Thébaïde: I. *Portes* 86 date de 219, la dernière attestation d’un préfet de Bérénice du 25.xii.216 et le dernier épistratège de Thébaïde daté a pour *terminus post quem* 216/217. Il n’est dès lors pas impossible que la fonction sans précédent (et peut-être éphémère) de *procurator Montis* ait été créée entre 217 et 21 pour remplacer celles d’épistratège de Thébaïde et de préfet de Bérénice”. For more about ἐπίτροπος ὄρουσ, see Hirt 2010, 70.

Furthermore, Cuvigny claims that Aurelius Sarapammon, the sender, was a member of the supreme military, though he had an Egyptian Greek name.⁵⁷

Another significant detail relies on the link between the *Third Century Crisis* and the causes of creating this office and its duties. Security considerations cannot have influenced the creation of this title, because the barbarians' assaults in the Egyptian Eastern Desert had apparently faded away at the beginning of the third century.⁵⁸ It might be argued that this title reflects the specific importance of the Eastern Desert trade in the AD 230s.

The duty of *epiteretes* (ἐπιτηρητής) existed from the late second century AD on. It expanded and became more efficient in the third decade of the third century and afterward, as *BGU* IV. 1062 (29 Aug. AD 236, Oxy.) highlights. It is a handover of a tax collection activity, συνάλλαγμα ἐπιτηρήσεως. Aurelius Sarapion alias Dios and Aurelius Hermias, freedmen of Hermias, son of the Sarapion, tax collectors of fine flour (l. 3: εἰς ἐπιτήρη[σ]την ὀνῆς πελωχικοῦ), transferred their work, for a year, to Amois, son of Amois, Syros alias Agathus Daimon, son of Ptolemy, and Gaius Iulius Alexander, son of Gaius Iulius Suburana Longus.⁵⁹

Wilcken comments on *W. Chres.* 276 = *BGU* IV. 1062 that, through this contract, two people transferred the business of their *epiteresis* to three other people in the same city. The text is a valuable piece of content, in particular because it clearly explains the duties of an *epiteretes*

⁵⁷ Cuvigny 2012, 90.

⁵⁸ The second century AD witnessed many casualties among both legionnaires in the Roman forts and the barbarians, cf. *O. Krok.* 6 (10 Dec. AD 108); *O. Krok.* 51 (Nov.–Dec. AD 109); *O. Krok.* 61 (AD 102/103 or 121/122); *O. Krok.* 87, col. i. 1–13; *O. Krok.* 87, col. ii. 98–106, 1–44 (c. AD 118); *O. Krok.* 87, 89–115 (c. AD 118). But with the beginning of the third century AD, in a kind of peaceful compatibility, the high command of the Roman army provided the Roman forts with additional bread ovens to meet the barbarians' need for bread. Their bread receipts were found inside the praesidia. *O. Did.* 41 (AD 201), ll. 1–10: ἤλθεν μοι Μαγειρην δεκανὸν καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ Βαρβάρους ε πεμφθέντα ὑπὸ Βαρατιτ ὑποτυράννου Βάρβαρος καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτοῖς κολ(οφώνιον) α καὶ ζεύγη ψομίον ιβ τῆ Φαωφια. Cf. Brun 2014 (a broadcasted lecture online) at: <https://www.college-de-france.fr/site/en-jean-pierre-brun/course-2014-10-14-11h00.htm>; *O. Xer.* Inv. 374 (3rd cent. AD) in: Cuvigny 2014, 165–198; Satzinger 2012, 1–49 = <https://www.slideshare.net/helmutsatzinger/the-barbarian-names-on-the-ostraca-from-the-eastern-desert-3rd-century-ce>.

⁵⁹ http://berlpap.smb.museum/record/?result=58&Publikation=%22BGU%20IV%20%22&order=Nr_mit_Zusatz-ASC&columns=pubnr&lang=en.

who was in charge of collecting taxes. According to the γνώμων and the custom of the nome, they are: issuing receipts to taxpayers, paying the amount of money raised to the government treasury, sending monthly billings to the strategos, keeping the invoices, submitting the files to be registered (καταχωρισμός), and transferring duplicates of the invoices to the examiner (ἐξεταστής).⁶⁰

The papyrus draws our attention to the *epiteretes*' official organizing duty to analyze and process the data in the AD 230s; despite no remarkable changes in the tax collecting measures, there was normal progressive filtering and classification of the tax lists. The word "compile" (l. 17: συστήσασθαι τοὺς ταύτης λόγους ὡς ἐκελ[εύσθη]) is applied to the κατ' ἄνδρα lists, which must have been extremely long and detailed. Extracting information from them for the strategos' own monthly statement was a painstaking and time-consuming process, requiring specialized personnel who were charged primarily or even exclusively with this task.⁶¹ A study of the progress in data processing concludes that the protocols in late third century Panopolites, in *P. Panop. Beatty* 1 (Sept. AD 298, Panopolis) and 2 (2 Feb. AD 300, Panopolis) were much the same as they had been three generations earlier in Fayum. This, in turn, would mean that administrative duties as shown in the Panopolite documentation had developed and matured much earlier.⁶²

One papyrus among the forty-three documents reveals unexplored aspects of the cultural life of that period. It is a receipt for a grain transfer,⁶³ showing the landowner C. Calpurnius Aurelius Theon, who was an Alexandrian officeholder and a member of the Museion (l. 2: ἀπὸ Μουσειῶν).⁶⁴ The classical authors testify that statesmen, along with representatives of the arts and sciences, were granted membership in the Museion, with its attendant benefits of tax exemption (ἀτέλεια) and dining in the Museion (σίτησις). Strabon (who stayed in Alexandria for some years in the 20s BC) states in his *Geography* that the Museion members gathered to eat common meals in the Museion (ἐν ᾧ τὸ συσσίτιον).⁶⁵

⁶⁰ Ll. 13–21; W. Chres. 276 comment.

⁶¹ Yiftach 2015, 297.

⁶² Yiftach 2015, 296–297.

⁶³ *P. Oxy.* L. 3564 (5 Oct. AD 235).

⁶⁴ Ll. 1–5: "Gaius Calpurnius Aurelius Theon, member of the Museion, and however I am styled, through me Aurelius Nilus alias Paternuthis, accounts manager, to Aurelius Apion, sealer of Seneceleu for year 13, greetings...".

⁶⁵ Strabo 17. 1. 8: τῶν δὲ βασιλείων μέρος ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον, ἔχον περίπατον καὶ ἐξέδραν καὶ οἶκον μέγαν, ἐν ᾧ τὸ συσσίτιον τῶν μετεχόντων τοῦ Μουσειῶν φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν (I cite the text from Jones 1930). Cf. Lewis 1963, 257.

But in the AD 230s, Cassius Dio states that Caracalla ordered in AD 212 (*Rom. hist.* 78. 7. 3) and AD 215 (*Rom. hist.* 78. 23. 3) that the city of Alexandria be punished by suspending the provision of the meals (τὰ συσσίτια) to the members of the Museion.

Nevertheless, in his *Lives of the Sophists*, Philostratus (AD 170–247/250) mentions the free meals in the Museion, as he says about the historiographer Dionysius of Miletus:⁶⁶

He was greatly honored by the cities that admired his talent, but the greatest honor was from the Emperor Hadrian, who appointed him a Satrap over peoples by no means obscure. He also enrolled him in the order of the knights who had free meals in the Museion. (By the Museion I mean a dining table in Egypt to which are invited the most distinguished men of all countries.)

Philostratus felt it was necessary to clarify the meaning of this honor with a phrase in parentheses. He uses a present tense participle ξυγκαλοῦσα in the sentence “a dining table in Egypt to which they are invited”. It might refer to the return of these banquets again during the time of Philostratus, who dedicated his book to the proconsul Gordian, during the period AD 230–238. However, there is no documentary evidence to support this interpretation. Furthermore, Philostratus’ intention might have been to describe the situation in Hadrian’s period (AD 117–138); moreover, the present tense participle refers to the continuous habit in the past, a custom that may already have vanished at the time of writing.

So, the first documentary evidence of the resumption of free meals in the Museion after Caracalla’s punishment of Alexandria is the document that dates back to the reign of Gordian III and presents Valerius Titianianus, the warden of the great Sarapis, as one of the tax-exempt who dine in the Museion (τῶν ἐν τῷ Μουσίῳ σιτουμένων ἀτελῶν).⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 1. 524. 5–11: Μεγάλων μὲν οὖν ἡξιοῦτο καὶ τῶν πόλεων, ὀπόσαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σοφία ἐθαύμαζον, μεγίστων δὲ ἐκ βασιλείως. Ἀδριανὸς γὰρ σατράπην μὲν αὐτὸν ἀπέφηνεν οὐκ ἀφανῶν ἐθνῶν, ἐγκατέλεξε δὲ τοῖς δημοσίᾳ ἰπεύουσι καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῷ Μουσείῳ σιτουμένοις, τὸ δὲ Μουσεῖον τράπεζα Αἰγυπτία ξυγκαλοῦσα τοὺς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ ἔλλογίμους. Tr. Wright 1921, with minor changes.

⁶⁷ *P. Mich.* XI. 620 (26 Jan. AD 240) Arsin., col. i. ll. 1–3 recto: Οὐαλερίῳ [Τ]ι[τ]ιανιανῷ νεωκόρῳ τοῦ μεγάλ[ου] Σαράπιδος ἀπὸ ἐπάρ[χ]ων οὐτιγούλων τῶν ἐν τῷ Μουσίῳ σιτουμένων ἀτελῶν (“To Valerius Titianianus, warden of the great Sarapis, formerly praefectus vigilum, one of the tax-exempt who are fed in the Museion”). For details about the title “member of Museion”, see Canfora 1989, 195–196.

The *P. Oxy.* L. 3564 (5 Oct. AD 235) is significant, for it shows that, during the reign of Maximinus Thrax, no additional benefits were restored, with an exception for the continuity of the usual honorary title “member of Museion” (l. 2: ἀπὸ Μουσειῶν). This evidence highlights the difference between the policy of Maximinus Thrax toward Egypt and that of Gordian III. There is much evidence of the Gordian III’s attempts to gain popularity among Egyptians⁶⁸ and other peoples of the Roman Empire,⁶⁹ which were utterly different from those of Maximinus. Gordian’s beneficent politics in Egypt appeared in many ways. When he replied to the three requests of the citizens of the city of Antinopolis, he expressed dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs in these cases. Thus, in response to the Antinopolites’ complaints of injustice in previous concessions,⁷⁰ the Emperor ordered to exempt goods for personal use from fees and to increase the number of city council members.⁷¹

No document provides us with new details about the social life, but one papyrus suggests a connection between the legal rules in AD 235 and financial need. A lease contract for the property of Aurelia Besous is one of the earlier papyrus attestations of the word συνεστῶς (l. 4: μετὰ συνεστῶτος)⁷² instead of the word κύριος. It proves that women benefited from the application of the *constitutio Antoniniana*, enacted by the emperor Caracalla, which made all free people in the Roman Empire citizens and offered women a much-desired exemption

⁶⁸ The popularity of Gordian III in Egypt is testified by the fact that he is among the few emperors who were mentioned by name on mummy labels, *T. Mom. Louvre* 173 (8 Feb. AD 239, Epoikion Nesos Apollinariados, Panopolites); *T. Mom. Louvre* 260 (AD 238); *T. Mom. Louvre* 545 (AD 238); *T. Mom. Louvre* 91 (AD 238). The mummy labels are the identification cards of the dead; Al-Ebiary noted in his research that only 13 of 1209 known labels set the date of death according to the Egyptian calendar and the year of the emperor’s rule. He infers that not mentioning the name of the emperor on the mummy labels was intentional: the native Egyptians were reluctant to register the names of their foreign rulers on the labels that accompanied them in the next life, but willingly accepted labeling the names of those few emperors who left a good memory in the hearts of the Egyptians. They are Hadrian (AD 117–138), Antoninus Pius (AD 138–161), Marcus Aurelius (AD 161–180), Septimius Severus (AD 193–211), and Gordian III (AD 243–247). Cf. Al-Ebiary 2007 [حسن أحمد الإبياري، بطاقات الموتى في مصر في العصر الروماني], 360–361; for more details about mummy labels, cf. Wagner 1974, 45–61; Boyaval 1980, 149–169.

⁶⁹ Kehoe 2007, 83; 85–86.

⁷⁰ Hoogendijk–Minnen 1987, 47.

⁷¹ *SB* XVIII. 13774–13776 (AD 241–242).

⁷² *P. Oxy.* VI. 912 (30 Aug. AD 235); lease of a cellar.

from male guardianship.⁷³ Several documents mention that a woman is “without a guardian by the right of children, *ius liberorum*” according to Roman law,⁷⁴ which shows that the appeal to the *ius liberorum* was made by women in different parts of the Roman Empire at least up to the fourth century.⁷⁵ But what was the reason why women applied to hold the *ius liberorum* when the *constitutio Antoniniana* grants them the same right to act without a male guardian?

Some scholars take the *ius liberorum* to be an honorific rather than a practical advantage,⁷⁶ and in Egypt, Roman women mention that they are bound by the *ius liberorum* even in situations where a tutor’s consent would not have been required. Thus, we should not discount the importance of an imperially granted honor for women in the highly honor-conscious society of the Roman Empire.⁷⁷

One should not discount the financial benefits of this status for the state. The main goal of the *constitutio Antoniniana* was fiscal. Thus, Cassius Dio remarked that the *constitutio* was a false honor, actually impoverishing the populace, in an attempt to fund extravagant spending on imperial favorites.⁷⁸ He states (*Hist. Rom.* 78. 9. 5):

This was the reason why he (Caracalla) made everyone in his realm Romans; he was ostensibly honoring them, but his real purpose was to increase his revenues by this means, since peregrines were not required to pay most of these taxes.

By the same token, the continuity of granting the *ius liberorum* ensured income from applications for it, its registration, and its recognition; to be officially registered, women who were qualified for the *ius liberorum* had to submit proof of their childbearing to the authorities⁷⁹ and surely paid fees for these measures, which was a good source of revenue for governmental personnel.

To conclude, this article proves that the *Third Century Crisis* had its impact on life in Egypt under the rule of Maximinus Thrax. Papyri attested to domestic disorders and restrictions on travel from Egypt on people indebted to the state. Ostraca clarified some partial administrative

⁷³ Ng 2008, 687.

⁷⁴ Vanderpe–Waebens 2010, 418–420.

⁷⁵ Ng 2008, 688.

⁷⁶ Dixon 1988, 89–91.

⁷⁷ Grubbs 2002, 38–39.

⁷⁸ Imrie 2018, 50.

⁷⁹ Grubbs 2002, 38.

changes in new titles, which also implied the more specific importance of the Eastern Desert trade. The economic crisis and the external political disturbances against Maximinus Thrax affected the benefits that were usually granted to the Museion, so that no additional benefits of ἀτέλεια and στήσις were restored.

Hanan M. I. Ismail
Ain Shams University, Cairo
 hanan.ismail@art.asu.edu.eg

Bibliography

- H. A. Al-Ebiary, “Betaqaat El-Mawta fi Mesr fi Al Asr El-Romani” [“The Mummy Labels in Egypt in the Roman Period”], *BCPS* 24 (2007) 293–368 https://bcps.journals.ekb.eg/article_27219.html.
- R. Bagnall, “P. Oxy. 4527 and the Antonine Plague in Egypt: Death or Flight?”, *JRA* 13 (2000) 288–292.
- T. D. Barnes, “Legislation against the Christians”, *JRS* 58: 1–2 (1968) 32–50.
- A. Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 43: 2 (Philadelphia 31991).
- B. Boyaval, “Notes sur quelques étiquettes de momies”, *BIFAO* 80 (1980) 149–169.
- J. P. Brun, “The Fort of Xeron Pelagos and the End of the Military Control on the Road to Berenice” 2/2 (A broadcasted lecture online), 11 am: 12 pm, 10 Oct. 2014 at: <https://www.college-de-france.fr/site/en-jean-pierre-brun/course-2014-10-14-11h00.htm>.
- L. Canfora, *The Vanished Library. A Wonder of the Ancient World*, tr. M. Ryle (Los Angeles 1989).
- H. Cuvigny (ed.), *Didymoi: une garnison romaine dans le désert oriental d’Égypte. II – les textes*, Fouilles de l’Ifao 67 (Cairo 2012).
- H. Cuvigny, “Papyrological Evidence on ‘Barbarians’ in the Egyptian Eastern Desert”, in: J. H. W. Dijkstra, G. Fisher (eds.), *Inside and Out: Interactions between Rome and the Peoples on the Arabian and Egyptian Frontiers in Late Antiquity* (Leuven 2014) 165–198.
- S. Dixon, *The Roman Mother* (Norman 1988).
- A. Fuks, *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece* (Leiden 1984).
- J. E. Grubbs, *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood*, Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World (New York 2002).
- V. Grumel, “Du nombre des persécutions païennes dans les anciennes chroniques”, *RÉAug* 2: 1–2 (1956) 59–66.
- A. M. Hirt, *Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World: Organizational Aspects 27 BC – AD 235* (Oxford 2010).

- C. Homoth-Kuhs, *Phylakes und Phylakon-Steuer im griechisch-römischen Ägypten: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des antiken Sicherheitswesens*, APF Beihefte 17 (Berlin 2005).
- F. A. J. Hoogendijk, P. V. Minnen, “Drei Kaiserbriefe Gordians III. an die Bürger von Antinoopolis: P. Vindob. G 25945 (pl. 7)”, *Tyche* 2 (1987) 41–74.
- J. D. Hughes, *Pan’s Travail: Environmental Problems of the Ancient Greeks and Romans* (Baltimore 1994).
- A. Imrie, *The Antonine Constitution. An Edict for The Caracallan Empire*, Impact of Empire 29 (Leiden 2018).
- A. Johnson, “Roman Egypt in The Third Century”, *JJP* 4 (1950) 151–158.
- H. L. Jones (tr.), *Strabo, Geography VIII*, Loeb Classical Library (London 1930).
- D. P. Kehoe, *Law and the Rural Economy in the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor 2007).
- P. Keresztes, “The Emperor Maximinus’ Decree of 235 AD: Between Septimius Severus and Decius”, *Latomus* 28: 3 (1969) 601–618.
- N. Lewis, “The Non-Scholar Members of the Alexandrian Museum”, *Mnemosyne* 16: 3 (1963) 257–261.
- N. Litinas, “P. Lond. III 128: Sale of A Donkey”, *ZPE* 124 (1999) 195–206.
- F. Mitthof, *Annona Militaris: die Heeresversorgung im spätantiken Ägypten: ein Beitrag zur Verwaltungs- und Heeresgeschichte des Römischen Reiches im 3. bis 6. Jh. n. Chr.* I, Papyrologica Florentina 32 (Florence 2001).
- H. G. Mullens, “The Revolt of the Civilians AD 237–8”, *G&R* 17 (1948) 65–77.
- E. Yue L. Ng, “Mirror Reading and Guardians of Women in the Early Roman Empire”, *J. Theol. Stud.* 59: 2 (2008) 679–695.
- D. Nappo, A. Zerbini, “On The Fringe: Trade and Taxes in the Egyptian Eastern Desert”: in: T. Kaizer, O. Hekster (eds.), *Frontiers in the Roman World, Impact of Empire* 13 (Leiden 2011) 61–78.
- A. M. Piganiol, “La fiscalité du Bas-Empire”, *Journal des Savants* 3 (1946) 128–139.
- A. M. Piganiol, “Opinator, nom propre ou titre de fonction?”, *REG* 59–60 (1946–1947) 13.
- A. Puk, “The Procuratorship of the Alexandrian Pharos”, *ZPE* 175 (2010) 227–230.
- G. Purpura, “‘Passaporti’ Romani”, *Aegyptus* 82: 1–2 (2002) 131–155.
- D. W. Rathbone, “The Dates of the Recognition in Egypt of the Emperors from Caracalla to Diocletianus”, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 101–31.
- J. R. Rea, “O. Leid. 144 and the Chronology of AD 238”, *ZPE* 9 (1972) 1–19.
- J. R. Rea, “Ordinatus”, *ZPE* 38 (1980) 217.
- H. Satzinger, “The ‘Barbarian’ Names on The Third-Century Ostraca from Xeron”, in: *Inside and Out. Interactions between Rome and The Peoples on The Arabian and Egyptian Frontiers in Late Antiquity (200–800 AD)* (Ottawa 2012) 1–49 = <https://www.slideshare.net/helmutsatzinger/the-barbarian-names-on-the-ostraca-from-the-eastern-desert-3rd-century-ce>.

- W. Scheidel, “A Model of Demographic and Economic Change in Roman Egypt after the Antonine Plague”, *JRA* 15 (2002) 94–114.
- W. Scheidel, J. Southerland, “Roman Wellbeing and the Economic Consequences of the ‘Antonine Plague’”, *Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics* 3.0 (2010) at: <https://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/pdfs/scheidel/011001.pdf>.
- C. E. van Sickle, “Some Further Observations on the Chronology of the Year 238 A.D.”, *CPh* 24: 3 (1929) 285–289.
- P. J. Sijpesteijn, “More Remarks on Some Imperial Titles in the Papyri II”, *ZPE* 54 (1984) 65–82.
- P. J. Sijpesteijn, “Short Remarks on Some Papyri V”, *Aegyptus* 71: 1–2 (1991) 43–51.
- J. A. Straus, *L’achat et la vente des esclaves dans l’Égypte romaine. Contribution papyrologique à l’étude de l’esclavage dans une province orientale de l’empire romain*, APF Beiheft 14 (Munich–Leipzig 2004).
- L. E. Tacoma, *Fragile Hierarchies. The Urban Elites of Third-Century Roman Egypt* (Leiden 2006).
- J. D. Thomas, “The Earliest Occurrence of the ‘Exactor Civitatis’ in Egypt (P. Giss. inv. 126 recto)”, *YCS* 28 (1985) 115–125.
- J. D. Thomas, “Notes on Papyri Relating to Claudia Isidora Also Called Apia”, *BASP* 41: 1/4 (2004) 139–153.
- P. W. Townsend, “The Chronology of the Year 238 AD”, *YCS* 1 (1928) 231–238.
- P. W. Townsend, “A Yale Papyrus and a Reconstruction of the Chronology of the Year 238 AD”, *AJP* 51: 1 (1930) 62–66.
- K. Vandorpe, S. Waebens, “Women and Gender in Roman Egypt: The Impact of Roman Rule”, in: K. Lembke et al. (eds.), *Tradition and Transformation: Egypt under Roman Rule*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 41 (Leiden 2010) 415–435.
- P. F. Venticinque, *Honor Among Thieves. Craftsmen, Merchants, and Associations in Roman and Late Roman Egypt* (Ann Arbor 2016).
- G. Wagner, “Étiquettes de momies grecques de l’Ifao”, *BIFAO* 74 (1974) 45–61.
- C. R. Whittaker (tr.), *Herodian of Antioch, History of The Empire II: Books v–viii*, Loeb Classical Library (London 1970).
- U. Wilcken, “Papyrus-Urkunden”, *APF* 4 (1908) 526–568.
- W. C. Wright (tr.), *Philostratus and Eunapius, Lives of the Sophists (Vitae Sophistarum)*, Loeb Classical Library (London 1921).
- U. Yiftach, “From Arsinoe to Alexandria and Beyond: Taxation and Information in Early Roman Egypt. A Discussion of P. Bagnall 70*”, *JJP* 45 (2015) 291–312.

This paper focuses on some aspects of Egypt’s history in the reign of Maximinus Thrax (Mid-March/25 March AD 235 – 10 May 238). The author argues that

the economic repercussions and the political upheaval in Egypt were tightly interwoven with the beginning of the *Third Century Crisis*. The article surveys forty-three documents (papyri and ostraca), through which new findings regarding the history of Egypt can be attained.

В статье рассматриваются некоторые аспекты египетской истории в правление Максимиана Фракийца (сер. марта / 25 марта 235 – 1 мая 238). Автор показывает, что экономические потрясения и политические беспорядки в Египте были тесно связаны с началом кризиса III в. н. э. Приводится обзор 43 документов (папирусов и остраконов), позволяющих получить новые сведения о социально-экономическом положении Египта в это время.

Keywords

DUBOVA

Apuleius, archaic vocabulary, parody, speech characterization, Venus
Апулей, архаическая лексика, Венера, пародия, речевая характеристика

HOGENMÜLLER

ambubaia, *Ameana* cycle, Catullus c. 41, text corruption
ambubaia, Катулл 41, порча текста, цикл об Амеане

ISMAIL

Maximinus Thrax, Mouseion of Alexandria, Roman Egypt, *the Third Century Crisis*
кризис III в. н.э., Максимиан Фракиец, Мусей Александрийский, римский Египет

KAZANSKAYA

Alexandrian scholarship, Homer, Iphianassa, Lucian, Nereids
александрийские филологи, Гомер, Ифианасса, Лукиан, Нереиды

KUZNETSOVA

Antonian Bill of 43 BC, *provocatio ad populum*, *quaestio de vi*, *quaestio maiestatis*
Антониев закон 43 г. до н.э., *provocatio ad populum*, *quaestio de vi*, *quaestio maiestatis*

LAPINI

Euripides, Greek etymology, Helen
Еврипид, Елена, греческая этимология

LARIONOVA

ancient mathematical education, *Disciplinae*, quadrivium, Varro
Варрон, *Дисциплины*, квадравиум, математическое образование в античности

LIBERMAN

exegesis, Sophocles, verbal criticism
критика текста, Софокл, экзегеза

LUCARINI

Agatharchides, Greek geographers, Marcian, textual criticism
Агатархид, греческие географы, критика текста, Маркиан

PETROVA

horsemanship, Simon, Xenophon
верховая езда, Ксенофонт, Симон

ZELTCHENKO

Calvus, conjectural emendation, Quintilian, Roman mourning customs,
Vatinius
Ватиний, Кальв, Квинтилиан, конъектуральная критика, траур в Риме

Научное издание

HYPERBOREUS:
Классическая филология и история
Vol. 26 2020 Fasc. 2

Ответственный редактор тома *С. К. Егорова*
Компьютерная верстка *А. Б. Левкина*

Учредители журнала *А. К. Гаврилов, Д. В. Панченко*
Регистрационное свидетельство № 0111029 от 27 августа 1993 года

Подписано в печать 29.01.2021. Формат 70 × 100^{1/16}. Печать офсетная.
Усл. печ. л. 13,6. Тираж 250 экз. Заказ № 018.

Отпечатано в типографии издательско-полиграфической фирмы «Реноме»,
192007 Санкт-Петербург, наб. Обводного канала, д. 40.
Тел./факс (812) 766-05-66. E-mail: book@renomespb.ru
www.renomespb.ru

